

THE ROLE OF SMART POWER IN U.S.-SPAIN RELATIONS, 1969-1986

By

DAVID A. JUSTICE

Bachelor of Arts in History  
Athens State University  
Athens, Alabama  
2012

Master of Arts in History  
University of North Alabama  
Florence, Alabama  
2014

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
May, 2020

THE ROLE OF SMART POWER IN U.S.-SPAIN  
RELATIONS, 1969-1986

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Laura Belmonte  
Dissertation Adviser

---

Dr. Douglas Miller

---

Dr. Matthew Schauer

---

Dr. Isabel Álvarez-Sancho

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation, this labor of love, would not be complete if it were not for a number of people. First, I would like to thank my dissertation committee of brilliant scholars. My advisor Laura Belmonte was integral in shaping this work and myself as an academic. Since my arrival at Oklahoma State, Dr. B has crafted me into the scholar that I am now. Her tireless encouragement, editing of multiple drafts, and support of this ever evolving project will always be appreciated. She also provided me with numerous laughs from the presidential pups, Willy and James. Doug Miller has championed my work since we began working together, and his candor and unconditional support was vital to finishing. Also, our discussions of Major League Baseball were much needed during coursework. Matt Schauer's mentorship was integral to my time at Oklahoma State. The continuous laughter and support during meetings, along with discussions of classic films, were vital to my time at Oklahoma State. Finally, Isabel Álvarez-Sancho provided brilliant insight into Spain, and offered encouragement throughout the writing process. *Le estoy agradecido.*

In addition to my committee, numerous academics helped develop me as a graduate student. I was taught or worked with in some capacity faculty members at

Oklahoma State that influenced me as an educator and a scholar. They include Richard Boles, David D'Andrea, James Huston, Jason Lavery, Michael Logan, L.G. Moses, Richard Rohrs, Kristen Shedd, Elizabeth Williams, and Anna Zeide. Jeffrey Bibbee at the University of North Alabama also deserves special recognition as his impact is both professional and personal. He was pivotal in making me believe that I could achieve a Ph.D., helping me at various junctures along my doctoral journey, and happily officiated my wedding. Also at UNA, I would like to thank Scott Infanger, Alejandra Alvarado-Brizuela, and Pat Sanders for the study abroad trip to Spain in the summer of 2016. This was a fantastic opportunity to immerse in Spanish culture, and not a day goes by that I don't think of my time in Salamanca. Additionally, I would like to thank Igor Contreras Zubillaga and Giulia Quaggio for organizing the Arts and Models of Democracy in Post-Authoritarian Iberian Peninsula at the University of Huddersfield. This was such a pivotal conference for me as it gave me the final push I needed for my dissertation. I am forever grateful for the opportunity they gave me and the support from the conference participants. Also, I would like to thank the group in Life Sciences East 213. Your support and Dungeons and Dragons games will be treasured forever. Finally, I would like to thank all the graduate students that have walked the hallow halls of Murray Hall. I especially would like to thank the constant presence of Jared Eberle and Andy Moser.

My research was vast and brought me in contact with a number of archives and archivists. They include Vanessa Lee at Columbia University, Mark Fischer at the Gerald R. Ford Library, Brittany Parris at the Jimmy Carter Library, Elisabeth Thomas at the Museum of Modern Art Archives, David A. Langbart at the National Archives II, John Zarrillo at New York University Archives, Meghan Lee-Parker at the Richard Nixon

Library, Renee Pappous at the Rockefeller Archive Center, Michael Pinckney at the Ronald Reagan Library, Geoffrey Stark at the University of Arkansas Library, and Laura Beth Schnitker at the University of Maryland Library. I was lucky to receive funding to travel to these archives. I would like to graciously thank the Gerald Ford Library for the Presidential Foundation Research Travel Grant, the Oklahoma State Graduate College for the Robberson Summer Research Fellowship, the Ashley Fund at Oklahoma State University for numerous travel grants, the Department of History for a Graduate Research Fellowship and various travel grants, and the Rockefeller Archive Center for a Research Stipend.

There are a number of family and friends that deserve recognition. Throughout this doctoral journey, they have been ever present in their love and support. First, I would like to thank my best friends, Evan & Chelsea Carter and Arron & Shayna Frasier. It is through their constant conversations on movies, music, and SEC football that I was able to survive this process. Additionally, I would like to thank my mother-in-law Ramona Shelton consistently offered love, support, and Chex Mix. My uncle Danny Fisher is always a person that I can go to for love and support, and I am happy to offer him with a history text that is not related to the Civil War. My cousin Micah Fisher deserves mention as well for his undying support. Finally, I would like to thank my parents Robbie and Tommy Justice. They sacrificed so much to provide me with a great education and worked hard to make sure I accomplished my undergraduate and graduate degrees debt free. They helped make this possible through their love, strength, and determination. I am forever in debt to them and I will carry them forever.

Last, but not least, is my beautiful wife and best friend, Caitlin. From the outset, I told her that her dedication would continue to grow with every major or minor step along the way. At this point I owe her a 100-page dedication, but I will try to be concise in my gratitude. Caitlin was my research assistant, my sounding board, and my greatest champion for this project. If not for her, this dissertation would be a totally different adventure. Her patience, kindness, and understanding throughout has been a beacon of light. Anyway, here's Wonderwall: "Because maybe you're gonna be the one that saves me, and after all, you're my wonderwall." I dedicate this dissertation to her.

Name: DAVID A. JUSTICE

Date of Degree: MAY, 2020

Title of Study: THE ROLE OF SMART POWER IN U.S.-SPAIN RELATIONS, 1969-1986

Major Field: HISTORY

Abstract: This dissertation offers a dual inquiry into the balance of U.S. defensive and cultural diplomacy with Spain during the transition to democracy mainly from an American perspective. First, it explores how the United States used hard power with Spain to maintain control of the military bases but employed soft power to offset anti-Americanism. These negotiations provided Spain with economic assistance and promised integration into the West via the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Community (EC), both of which Spain coveted. However, once the Spanish transition began, the United States emphasized soft power. These tactics included public diplomacy, educational exchanges, television, and human rights rhetoric. The United States Information Agency (USIA) utilized public diplomacy on themes as diverse as the Apollo space program, democracy promotion, and economic rights to build goodwill in Spain for Americans. The Fulbright program attempted to win hearts and minds in Spain through American Studies programs and educational exchanges. The USIA engaged television as a method to reach the Spanish general public with documentaries and programs that illustrated U.S.-Spanish cultural understanding. For human rights, the presidents often used Spain as an example to the world of how to transition to democracy peacefully and promote human rights.

Second, this study examines how nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) played a role in the development of U.S. soft power. Through education, the Ford Foundation (FF) helped Spain develop and institute educational reforms while the preoccupation of Fulbright was with American Studies promotion and educational exchanges. For television, Children's Television Workshop (CTW) developed an international co-production of *Sesame Street* for Spain that Televisión Española (TVE) intended to use to develop a national identity. However, the American NGO's lack of cultural understanding of Spain nearly caused *Barrio Sésamo* to end prematurely. Amnesty International (AI) along with other NGOs provided evidence of human rights violations in Spain while American presidents made speeches about how Spain's transition represented the importance of human rights. Each of these NGOs directly or indirectly influenced the development of U.S. soft power in Spain.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
CAST OF CHARACTERS.....	vi
ABBREVIATIONS .....	x
INTRODUCTION – Bienvenido <i>Guernica</i> and Democracy.....	1
CHAPTER 1 – The Paternalism of Fascist Gunslingers: Leadership, Impressions, 23-F, and U.S. Hard Power .....	22
CHAPTER 2 – Quid Pro Quo: The Spanish Military Bases, NATO, The European Community, and U.S. Hard Power .....	64
CHAPTER 3 – Selling “tu amigo americano”: The USIA, Public Diplomacy, and Soft Power .....	111
CHAPTER 4 – No Dead Languages, Only Dormant Minds: Education and Soft Power .....	148
CHAPTER 5 – D is for Democracy: Television and Soft Power .....	177
CHAPTER 6 – “A nightmare of noise without movement”: Human Rights and Soft Power .....	205
CONCLUSION – Generalissimo Francisco Franco is Still Dead .....	235
REFERENCES .....	24



## CAST OF CHARACTERS

- David L. Aaron* – Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 1977-1981
- Nuño Aguirre de Cárcer* – Director General de América in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1966-1970; Spanish Ambassador to the United States, 1982-1983
- Jaime Alba Delibes* – Spanish Ambassador to the United States, 1974-1976
- Blanca Álvarez Mantilla* – TVE Presenter and Original Producer of *Barrio Sésamo*
- Burnett Anderson* – Public Affairs Officer at USIS Madrid
- José María de Areilza, Count of Motrico* – Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1975-1976
- Jaime Arguelles* – Spanish Ambassador to the United States, 1970-1972
- Carlos Arias Navarro* – Mayor of Madrid, 1965-1973; Prime Minister, 1973-1976
- Reginald Bartholomew* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1986-1989
- Jack R. Binns* – Deputy Chief of Mission to Ambassador Enders, 1984-1986
- Stephen C. Bosworth* – Economic Officer at Madrid Embassy, 1967-1971
- John Brademas* – President of New York University, 1981-1991
- Alan Brown* – Retired Navy Officer in Madrid
- Zbigniew Brzezinski* – National Security Advisor, 1977-1981
- Leopoldo Calvo-Sotelo* – Prime Minister of Spain, 1981-1982
- Luis Carrero Blanco* – Vice President of the Government, 1967-1973; Prime Minister of Spain, 1973
- Santiago José Carrillo Solares* – Secretary-General of PCE
- Jimmy Carter* – U.S. President, 1977-1981
- Fernando María Castiella y Maíz* – Foreign Minister, 1957-1969

*Warren Christopher* – Deputy Secretary of State, 1977-1981  
*Pedro Cortina y Mauri* – Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1974-1975  
*Don Juan de Borbón* – Father of Juan Carlos  
*Thomas O. Enders* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1983-1986  
*John P. Fitzpatrick* – Gulf Oil Representative in Madrid  
*Gerald Ford* – U.S. Vice President, 1973-1974; U.S. President, 1974-1977  
*Lois Fortune* – CTW Producer  
*Peter Fraenkel* – Program Associate at the Ford Foundation  
*Manuel Fraga Iribarne* – Minister of the Interior, 1975-1976; Leader of AP, 1976-1986  
*Francisco Franco* – Dictator of Spain, 1936-1975  
*Felipe González* – Secretary-General of the PSOE; Prime Minister of Spain, 1982-1996  
*Alexander Haig* – Deputy National Security Advisor, 1970-1973; White House Chief of Staff, 1973-1974; Secretary of State, 1981-1982  
*Robert C. Hill* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1969-1972  
*Martin J. Hillenbrand* – Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, 1969-1972  
*Lutrelle Horne* - Director of the International Division of Children’s Television Workshop  
*U. Alexis Johnson* – Under Secretary for Political Affairs in the State Department, 1969-1973  
*Juan Carlos I* – King of Spain, 1975-2014  
*Abraham Katz* – Director of the Office of Regional and Political Affairs, Bureau of European Affairs, Department of State, 1967-1974  
*Francis M. Kinnelly* – Science and Technology Attaché at the Madrid Embassy  
*Henry Kissinger* – National Security Advisor, 1969-1975; Secretary of State, 1973-1977  
*Virginia Knauer* – Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs, 1981-1989  
*Anthony Lake* – Director of Policy Planning, Department of State, 1977-1981  
*George W. Landau* – Country Director of the Office of Spanish and Portuguese Affairs, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, State Department, 1966-1972  
*José Pedro Pérez Llorca* – Foreign Minister, 1980-1982  
*Laureano López Rodó* – Foreign Minister, 1973-1974  
*Gregorio López-Bravo y Castro* – Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1969-1973

*Edward McBride* – Cultural Attaché at the Madrid Embassy

*Robert J. McCloskey* – Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, 1963-1973

*Walter Mondale* – Vice President, 1977-1981

*Fernando Morán López* – Foreign Minister, 1982-1985

*Ron Nessen* – White House Press Secretary, 1974-1977

*Enrique Nicanor González* – Director of *Barrio Sésamo* pilot and first season

*Richard Nixon* – U.S. President, 1969-1974

*Francisco Fernández Ordóñez* – Foreign Minister, 1985-1992

*John Petty* – Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, 1968-1972

*John Poindexter* – National Security Advisor, 1985-1986

*Ronald Reagan* – Governor of California, 1967-1975; U.S. President, 1981-1989

*John Reinhardt* – Director of United States Information Agency/United States International Communications Agency, 1977-1980

*Elliot Richardson* – Under Secretary of State, 1969-1970

*Horacio Rivero Jr.* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1972-1974

*Nelson Rockefeller* – Vice President, 1974-1977

*William P. Rogers* – Secretary of State, 1969-1973

*Donald Rumsfeld* – White House Chief of Staff, 1974-1975; Secretary of Defense, 1975-1977

*McKinney Russell* – USIA worker at the American Embassy in Madrid

*George P. Schultz* – Secretary of the Treasury, 1972-1974; Secretary of State, 1982-1989

*Brent Scowcroft* – National Security Advisor, 1975-1977

*Narcís Serra* – Minister of Defense, 1982-1991

*Robert E. Service* – Political Counselor, American Embassy in Madrid, 1982-1987

*David E. Simcox* – Counselor for Political Affairs, American Embassy in Madrid, 1972-1975

*Sofía of Greece and Denmark* – Queen of Spain, 1975-2014

*Wells Stabler* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1975-1978

*Adolfo Suárez González* – Prime Minister of Spain, 1976-1981

*Terence Todman* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1978-1983

*Cyrus Vance* – Secretary of State, 1977-1980

*José Luis Villar Palasí* – Minister of Education, 1968-1973

*Robert F. Wagner, Jr.* – U.S. Ambassador to Spain, 1968-1969

*Caspar Weinberger* – Secretary of Defense, 1981-1987

*Charles Z. Wick* – Director of the United States Information Agency, 1981-1989

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Abbreviations in Text

23-F – The attempted coup d'état in Spain on February 23, 1981

AEDEAN – Spanish Association of Anglo-North American Studies

AI – Amnesty International

AIUSA – Amnesty International USA

AMSPEC – American Specialists

AP – Alianza Popular

BBC – British Broadcasting Corporation

CAT – Campaign Against Torture

CSCE – Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe

CTW – Children's Television Workshop

CU – Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs in the Department of State

EC – European Community

ETA – Euskadi Ta Askatasuna

FF – Ford Foundation

FRAP – Frente Revolucionario Antifascista y Patriota (Revolutionary Antifascist  
Patriotic Front)

GATT – General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

GOs – Government organizations

ICA – United States International Communications Agency

INCI – Instituto de Cuestiones Internacionales

MoMA – Museum of Modern Art, New York City

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization  
NGOs – Nongovernment organizations  
NMAs – Nonmilitary Aspects of U.S.-Spanish Agreements  
NSC – National Security Council  
NYU – New York University  
OAS – Organization of American States  
PAO – Public Affairs Officer  
PCE – Partido Comunista de España (Communist Party of Spain)  
PSOE – Partido Socialista Obrero Español (Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party)  
RTVE – Corporación de Radio y Televisión Española  
STAG – Short-Term American Grantees  
TVE – Televisión Española  
UCD – Unión de Centro Democrático (Union of the Democratic Center)  
UN – United Nations  
USIA – United States Information Agency  
USIS – United States Information Service

Abbreviations in Footnotes

CIES – Council for International Exchange of Scholars Records  
CTW – Children’s Television Workshop Archives  
CU – Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection  
CUL – Columbia University Library  
*FRUS* – *Foreign Relations of the United States*  
GRFL – Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library  
JCL – Jimmy Carter Presidential Library  
NARA – National Archives II  
NYUL – New York University Library  
RAC – Rockefeller Archives Center  
RNL – Richard Nixon Library  
RRL – Ronald Reagan Library

UAL – University of Arkansas Library

UMDL – University of Maryland Library

WHCF – White House Central File

WHORM - White House Office of Records Management

## INTRODUCTION

Bienvenido *Guernica* and Democracy

***“Other details could be observed, but none of them is important, or relevant to the truthful narration of this history—and no history is bad so long as it is truthful.”  
-Miguel de Cervantes<sup>1</sup>***

A bull stands over a grieving mother as she clutches her deceased child. A horse screams in agony as it collapses over a dead soldier who grasps a broken sword. Two women look aghast over the tragedy. A structure catches fire as a woman screams inside, her hand in the form of an airplane flying over the building. Painted in black, white, and grey, Pablo Picasso’s *Guernica* depicts these striking images. The colossal oil painting—eleven feet tall and twenty-five feet wide—portrays the violence of the 1937 German bombing of Guernica and is symbolic of the carnage in the Spanish Civil War. After proclaiming victory in the Civil War in 1939, the Nationalist leader Francisco Franco declared himself *Caudillo de España* (the Leader of Spain) and began a dictatorship that would span almost four decades. Picasso allegedly wished the painting to stay out of Spain if Franco remained dictator and only return after the restoration of democratic institutions. It was unveiled at the 1937 Paris International Exposition, toured Europe, and eventually landed in New York City. The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) housed

---

<sup>1</sup> Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quijote* (London: Penguin Classics, 2018), 76.



the painting for decades as the Franco regime requested the return of the painting in Madrid. After the death of Franco and restoration of democracy in Spain, MoMA reluctantly gifted the painting to Madrid, which excitedly welcomed the “homecoming” of Picasso’s masterpiece. It settled in a heavily guarded annex of the Prado, El casón del buen retiro, among other acquired Picasso works and alongside the other great works of Spanish art.<sup>2</sup> The repatriation of *Guernica* is symbolic of U.S.-Spain relations during the transition to democracy.

The efforts of the Franco regime to return *Guernica* escalated as the 1960s drew to a close. Picasso’s French lawyer, Roland Dumas, explained in a letter to Director of the Department of Painting and Sculpture William S. Lieberman how Franco “pretends that Picasso had, in the past, made a gift of this work to ‘Spanish Youth’ and that this youth now wishes to view it in Spain itself.”<sup>3</sup> MoMA made it clear that it would not return the piece to Spain even after the death of Franco and the supposed ascension of Juan Carlos de Borbón and constitutional monarchy. Richard Koch, the General Counsel of MoMA, explained that the museum was aware of Picasso’s “wish” to keep the portrait out of authoritarian Spain, but “the time and manner of the disposition of the picture will have to be decided by Mme. Picasso and the other heirs of the artist.”<sup>4</sup> One factor not discussed in MoMA’s decision to keep *Guernica* was that it was one of the most popular parts of the museum. Essentially, the museum did not want to give away something to Spain from which it was benefiting.

---

<sup>2</sup> Eventually, the *Guernica* moved to Museo Reina Sofia.

<sup>3</sup> Roland Dumas to William Lieberman, November 12, 1969; Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Papers, XI.B.11; The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

<sup>4</sup> Richard H. Koch to Mr. M.A. Clinch, September 16, 1976; P&S *Guernica* Records; Correspondence 1970s; Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

With movement toward democracy, Spanish officials believed it was time for MoMA to give the *Guernica* back. As art historian Gijs van Hensbergen explains, the homecoming of Picasso's work "would be read as nothing less than a complete catharsis; a recognition that a painful history had been surmounted and successfully assimilated, and that symbolically it might act as an imprimatur of the new democracy's legitimacy."<sup>5</sup> Spanish politicians shared this view. During a trip to the United States, future prime minister Felipe González visited MoMA to see the *Guernica*. Upon his return to Spain, he wrote to Koch that he enjoyed his visit to the museum. González expressed that he was sure for Koch "it would be hard not to see the painting occupying the wall of your Museum but you may agree with me that it would be nice to have it on our walls in our Prado."<sup>6</sup> Spain believed gifting *Guernica* would be the United States supporting the Spanish transition. Still, the painting remained in New York. Some U.S. Senators, including George McGovern and Joe Biden, approved a resolution in 1978 to have *Guernica* returned to Spain.<sup>7</sup> However, this was simply a symbolic gesture and met resistance from Rubin and the MoMA staff.

If the *Guernica* were to move to Spain, it would be with the approval of Dumas. He explained that "there was something very political about the whole situation" and he would not be cooperative.<sup>8</sup> However, by November 1979, MoMA began the process to move the *Guernica* to the Prado, but feared Picasso's son Claude may halt the move.

---

<sup>5</sup> Gijs van Hensbergen, *Guernica: The Biography of a Twentieth-Century Icon* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2004), 284.

<sup>6</sup> Felipe González to Richard H. Koch, December 3, 1977; P&S Guernica Records; Correspondence 1970s; Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

<sup>7</sup> Section 409 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1979 was the U.S. Congress sending congratulations to the Spanish government for their restoration of democracy. Their present to the Spanish democracy would be Picasso's *Guernica* arriving in Madrid.

<sup>8</sup> Letter to Richard Oldenburg, June 6, 1977; P&S Guernica Records; Doc. of Return and Extended Loan; Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

Dumas proposed “some sort of indemnity from the Spanish government which would arguably permit us to send the postscripts notwithstanding the potential claim.”<sup>9</sup> Cyrus Vance, the former Secretary of State under Jimmy Carter, became part of a small group of Spaniards and Americans who negotiated the moving details. Vance concluded that Dumas was Picasso’s designee, not Picasso’s family, and MoMA was “obligated to deliver these works to Spain with reasonable promptness upon the determination by Maître Dumas that Picasso’s condition has been satisfied.”<sup>10</sup> The leadership of MoMA wrote a letter to the Spanish government explaining it was ready to deliver the painting to Madrid, and the Prado revealed the *Guernica* in September 1981. The artistic symbol of the Spanish Civil War and of the Spanish people was now in Spain. The United States appropriated the painting and made it an abstract symbol of U.S. sanctioned democracy. The new Spanish democracy received its acknowledgment, and the United States believed they provided it despite holding out to see if the transition succeeded.

The struggle to acquiesce the *Guernica* to Spain is representative of how the United States viewed the Spanish transition to democracy. The United States enjoyed a quid pro quo with the Franco dictatorship since the 1953 Pact of Madrid. Prior to the Pact of Madrid, the bilateral relationship between the United States and Spain was less than friendly. Following the global economic collapse in the early 1930s, the military dictatorship of General Miguel Primo de Rivera was overthrown, and republicans committed to ousting the monarchy of King Alfonso XIII to establish a republic. Alfonso fled to Rome and in 1931 the Spanish Second Republic was founded. The United States

---

<sup>9</sup> John B. Koegel to William Rubin, November 13, 1979; Doc. of Return and Extended Loan; Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

<sup>10</sup> “Re: Guernica” by Cyrus Vance, August 12, 1981; Painting and Sculpture, Guernica 1981; box 64; Blanchette H. Rockefeller Papers; Series 4: Museum of Modern Art; Rockefeller Archives Center (hereby referred to as RAC).

was skeptical of the Second Republic and believed they were susceptible to a possible Bolshevik turn. From 1932 to 1935, the State Department under Franklin D. Roosevelt feared that Spain's "instability, immature political institutions, and economic troubles could still lead to its succumbing to communism."<sup>11</sup> During the Second Republic, a number of major reforms passed including a major effort at land reform. Increases in violence, popular uprisings, and strikes made it clear the republic was unstable. A military conspiracy led by Franco attempted a coup d'état in July 1936 and began the Spanish Civil War.<sup>12</sup> Some in the State Department believed that the rebel faction was an attractive prospect to bring order to Spain and prevent the spread of Bolshevism. Yet, by the time Roosevelt decided to support the Loyalist cause, it was too late as Franco had the backing of Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy. Franco believed a German victory was imminent so he remained close to Hitler; but, as it became clear that Nazi Germany would not last, Franco moved to a neutral stance and looked to the Allies for support. The United States and Western Europe chose to ostracize Spain until 1947.

The bipolar world of the early Cold War caused the United States to reconsider their views of Franco and Spain. One of the major factors in this reevaluation of Franco

---

<sup>11</sup> David F. Schmitz, 98-9.

<sup>12</sup> For select books on the Spanish Second Republic and Civil War, see: Hugh Thomas, *The Spanish Civil War* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961); Gabriel Jackson, *The Spanish Republic and the Civil War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965); Richard A.H. Robinson, *The Origins of Franco's Spain: The Right, the Republic, and Revolution, 1931-1936* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1970); Edward Malefakis, *Agrarian Reform and Peasant Revolution in Spain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971); Raymond Carr, *Spanish Tragedy: Civil War in Perspective* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1977); Stanley G. Payne, *Spain's First Democracy: The Second Republic, 1931-1936* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993); George R. Esenwein and Adrian Shubert, *Spain at War: The Spanish Civil War in Context, 1931-1939* (London: Longman, 1995); Martin Blinkhorn, *Democracy and Civil War in Spain, 1931-1939* (London: Routledge, 1996); Ronald Radosh and Mary R. Habeck, *Spain Betrayed: The Soviet Union in the Spanish Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); Michael Seidman, *Republic of Egos: A History of the Spanish Civil War* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002); Helen Graham, *The Spanish Civil War: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Paul Preston, *The Spanish Civil War* revised (London: Harper Perennial, 2006); Payne, *The Collapse of the Spanish Republic, 1933-1936: Origins of the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006); Julián Casanova, *The Spanish Republic and Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

was his vehement anti-communism. The fears brought on by the spread of communism to China and Korea led to anxieties the Soviet ideology would spread beyond the Iron Curtain. With Franco controlling Spain, the West did not have to worry about a communist takeover. Further, the United States believed it would be better to have domestic stability in Spain than a regime change that would bring about political ambiguity.<sup>13</sup> However, the major factor that led to the United States' reevaluation of Spain was the use of military bases. Generals George Marshall and Omar Bradley were adamant that the United States acquired military bases in Spain despite Harry S. Truman being uneasy on recognizing Franco.<sup>14</sup> By using the bases in Spain, the United States would be able to solidify Western Europe against the Soviet Union.

The Pact of Madrid gave economic and military aid to Spain and the United States access to Spanish military bases for strikes in the Mediterranean and Middle East. Simultaneously, the United States and Spain established cultural exchanges through the *quid pro quo*. This arrangement benefitted Franco by propping up his dictatorship and providing an ally on the global stage, which Spain lacked since World War II. At the same time, it provided the United States with defensive capabilities in the Cold War. Yet, even after Franco died and Spain began liberalizing, the United States remained steadfast in preserving their grip over Spain despite protests from Spanish politicians and citizens. Washington could not accept a change to the status quo in Spain for fear of disrupting their Cold War defensive interests. However, once it became clear that the transition to democracy succeeded, the United States allowed the painting to move to Madrid. This

---

<sup>13</sup> Heiberg, 15.

<sup>14</sup> Schmitz, 166.

happened to rebuild goodwill with the Spanish public despite decades of propping up Franco and anti-Americanism.

This dissertation offers a dual inquiry into the balance of U.S. defensive and cultural diplomacy with Spain during the transition to democracy mainly from an American perspective. First, it explores how the United States used hard power with Spain to maintain control of the military bases but employed soft power to offset anti-Americanism. These negotiations provided Spain with economic assistance and promised integration into the West via the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Community (EC), both of which Spain coveted.<sup>15</sup> However, once the Spanish transition began, the United States emphasized soft power. These tactics included public diplomacy, educational exchanges, television, and human rights rhetoric. The United States Information Agency (USIA) utilized public diplomacy on themes as diverse as the Apollo space program, democracy promotion, and economic rights to build goodwill in Spain for Americans. The Fulbright program attempted to win hearts and minds in Spain through American Studies programs and educational exchanges. The USIA engaged television as a method to reach the Spanish general public with documentaries and programs that illustrated U.S.-Spanish cultural understanding. For human rights, the presidents often used Spain as an example to the world of how to transition to democracy peacefully and promote human rights.

Second, this study examines how nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) played a role in the development of U.S. soft power. Through education, the Ford Foundation (FF) helped Spain develop and institute educational reforms while the preoccupation of

---

<sup>15</sup> For the purpose of this study, I use the term “the West” to signify First World organizations, specifically NATO and the EC. Though Spain is a Western country, it was not involved in these organizations due to the Franco regime.

Fulbright was with American Studies promotion and educational exchanges. For television, Children's Television Workshop (CTW) developed an international co-production of *Sesame Street* for Spain that Televisión Española (TVE) intended to use to develop a national identity. However, the American NGO's lack of cultural understanding of Spain nearly caused *Barrio Sésamo* to end prematurely. Amnesty International (AI) along with other NGOs provided evidence of human rights violations in Spain while American presidents made speeches about how Spain's transition represented the importance of human rights. Each of these NGOs directly or indirectly influenced the development of U.S. soft power in Spain.

Spain and the transition to democracy are often overshadowed in studies of the Cold War. Scholars often focus on the political transformations in the Global South, the Middle East conflicts in the 1970s and 1980s, the Vietnam War, and the ideological battles beyond the Iron Curtain. However, the Spanish transition to democracy was a landmark event of the period as it showed a peaceful transition from authoritarianism to a constitutional monarchy. Further, it illustrated a nation standing up to one of the Cold War superpowers, much as Odd Arne Westad depicts in the Global South.<sup>16</sup> The domestic framework of Spain felt the economic, political, and cultural influence of the United States, and Spanish leaders often used the United States to further their strategies.

Moreover, the United States knew the importance of Spain to their Cold War agendas. Communism played a vital role in U.S.-Spain relations during this period. Both Richard Nixon and Franco had strong anti-communist pasts. Gerald Ford and Henry Kissinger continued this approach. As the transition began, Kissinger sought a slow transition for Spain and believed that the legalization of the Partido Comunista de España

---

<sup>16</sup> Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 3.

would be disastrous. He warned that quickly liberalizing could lead to another coup d'état and a second civil war. However, Jimmy Carter and his national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski were open to working with Eurocommunism and the Spanish Left. They offered U.S. travel grants for Spanish communist leaders. However, the Ronald Reagan administration returned to a stauncher anti-communist stance, and had conflicts with Spain over communism in Latin America. However, the major U.S. Cold War agenda was the rights to the military bases in Spain.

The obvious reason was the use of the military bases, but another key reason was the transition itself. The peaceful integration of a constitutional monarchy gave the United States an example of democracy it could export to the Global South. They could use the Spanish transition as a method of soft power; however, in Spain, the United States utilized smart power. The focus of this study on smart power brings together both the positives and negatives of U.S. foreign relations with an objective view of diplomacy. The three cultural aspects that are discussed in depth in this dissertation—educational exchanges, television, and human rights—show how the United States reached the Spanish public through refurbished and fresher approaches.

I utilize Joseph S. Nye, Jr.'s theory of smart power to explain American diplomatic efforts during the Spanish transition to democracy. According to Nye, smart power is the combination of hard power and soft power.<sup>17</sup> Hard power is the use of “coercion and payment,” and soft power is the ability to “obtain outcomes through

---

<sup>17</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Smart Power,” *New Perspectives Quarterly* vol 26, no. 2 (2009), 7. Smart power also discussed in Don Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015).



attraction.”<sup>18</sup> Further, hard power can rest on inducements or threats—the carrot or the stick respectively—while soft power rests on one country’s ability to attract.<sup>19</sup> In the case of the Spanish transition, the United State utilized hard power to maintain control of the bases. This included dictating the base negotiations and using entrance to Western organizations as inducements. Yet, to use smart power, Washington had to employ soft power as well. Examples included promoting scientific and technological education, American Studies programs, documentaries on the U.S. democratic process, and economic rights promotion. Yet, as Nye explains, NGOs also produce their own soft power that may either complement or complicate a government’s soft power. In the instance of Spain, NGOs acted as both supplement and foil to U.S. soft power. The FF and CTW built soft power within Spain by supporting educational reform and providing children’s educational programming, respectively. However, AI and other human rights NGOs pointed out abuses within Spanish borders and the presidential administrations did not use this information to build attractiveness with the Spanish public.

In taking the American perspective of the Spanish transition to democracy, I have decided to frame this dissertation between 1969 and 1986. Most histories of the Spanish transition begin with the death of Franco in 1975 and continue to one of two destinations: the approval of the Constitution in 1978 or the election of the Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party in 1982. However, I appropriate a “long transition” paradigm and contend that the United States perceived the Spanish evolution as occurring from the late 1960s to the NATO referendum in 1986. Two events led to my choosing of 1969 to begin this study.

---

<sup>18</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power,” *Foreign Affairs* vol. 88, no. 4 (July/August 2009), 160.

<sup>19</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), 5.

This is the year that Richard Nixon began his tenure at the White House and Franco announced that Juan Carlos would be his heir apparent. Shortly after this, the United States began to anticipate how the transition to post-Francoist Spain would occur in tandem with the ongoing *apertura* (opening) of Spain. Throughout the transition and base negotiations, the United States utilized entrance to NATO as a hard power inducement. Nonetheless, Spain left entrance to NATO up to the public in a referendum in 1986. I therefore conclude my dissertation with the vote and Spain's official ascension to Western organizations like NATO and the EC.

This work is in dialogue with a few bodies of historical narratives. The most obvious is the historiography of U.S.-Spain relations. My work accentuates this historical field in two distinct ways. There is a plethora of monographs and articles that examine the Franco regime and the early Cold War implications on the bilateral relationship.<sup>20</sup> These scholars often hint towards the transition in their work, but do not extend their analyses beyond Franco's death. My work expands on this by examining how Franco's death and the reheating of the Cold War impacted the bilateral relationship. In addition, my work examines the role of culture in U.S.-Spain relations. Many works that do concentrate on the Spanish transition often focus on the economic and political impacts

---

<sup>20</sup> For histories on U.S.-Spanish relations in the early Cold War, see: R. Richard Rubottom and J. Carter Murphy, *Spain and the United States: Since World War II* (New York: Praeger, 1984); Boris N. Liedtke, "Spain and the United States, 1945-1975," in *Spain and the Great Powers in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999); Liedtke, *Embracing a Dictatorship: U.S. Relations with Spain, 1945-53* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); Ángel Viñas, *En las garras del águila: Los pactos con Estados Unidos de Francisco Franco a Felipe González (1945-1995)* (Barcelona, Critica, 2003); Oscar Calvo-Gonzalez, "American Military Interest and Economic Confidence in Spain under the Franco Dictatorship," in *The Journal of Economic History* (2007); Charles Powell y Juan Carlos Jiménez, eds. *Del Autoritarismo a la Democracia: Estudios de Política Exterior Española* (Madrid: Sílex, 2007); Charles T. Powell, "The United States and Spain: From Franco to Juan Carlos," in *Spain Transformed: The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959-75*, ed. Nigel Townson (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010); Neal M. Rosendorf, *Franco Sells Spain to America: Hollywood, Tourism and Public Relations as Postwar Spanish Soft Power* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); David Garcia Cantalapiedra, "Spanish Foreign Policy, the United States, and Soft Bandwagoning" in *Contemporary Spanish Foreign Policy* eds. David Garcia Cantalapiedra and Ramon Pacheco Pardo (London: Routledge, 2014).

of the base negotiations.<sup>21</sup> Rarely, do these works focus on the significance of cultural exchanges and soft power.

As one of the most recent entries into this historiography, Morten Heiberg's *U.S.-Spanish Relations after Franco, 1975-1989: The Will of the Weak* explores how the transition to democracy influenced the bilateral relationship. My work both complements and diverges from Heiberg's monograph. His main argument is that the international elements of the United States and Europe, not internal dynamics, propelled the Spanish transition. It is important to understand the transnational aspects of the Spanish transition, but they are not the sole factors. The United States did want to influence how Spain integrated democracy, but the internal anger towards America made it clear that their influence could only go so far. Further, the United States constantly used NATO as a tool of their hard power, but the Spanish public ultimately decided it. In addition, Heiberg offers an analysis of U.S.-Spain relations from the Spanish perspective, and only uses U.S. archival research from the Ronald Reagan Library or what is available online. My work will offer the American perspective and utilize several American government and nongovernment archives.

When framing this work within cultural diplomacy, there are a few ways that my work will build on previous monographs and edited volumes. This work will be a first to explore the role of smart power in U.S.-Spain relations. Often histories have fixated solely on hard power or soft power. One example is the edited volume of Spanish and

---

<sup>21</sup> For histories on the impact of military bases on U.S.-Spain relations see: Rubottom and Murphy; Eusebio Mujal-Leon, "Rei(g)ning in Spain," in *Foreign Policy* 51 (Summer 1983); Ángel Viñas, "Breaking the Shackles from the Past: Spanish Foreign Policy from Franco to Felipe González" in *Spain and the Great Powers*; Julio Crespo MacLennan, *Spain and the Process of European Integration, 1957-85* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2000); Charles Powell, "The United States and Spain: From Franco to Juan Carlos;" Powell, *El Amigo Americano: España y Estados Unidos: de la Dictadura a la Democracia* (Barcelona: Galaxia Guttenberg, 2011); Morten Heiberg, *U.S.-Spanish Relations after Franco, 1975-1989: The Will of the Weak* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2018).

American scholars, *U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain: Selling Democracy?*<sup>22</sup> This volume is full of excellent scholarship on the role of public diplomacy in U.S.-Spain relations during the late Franquismo and early transition. However, there is little to no analysis of the transition beyond Adolfo Suárez's tenure as Prime Minister of Spain. This dissertation will continue the path laid by these scholars and extend the narrative. My work is a spiritual sequel to Neal Rosendorf's *Franco Sells Spain to America: Hollywood, Tourism, and Public Relations as Postwar Spanish Soft Power*. Rosendorf spotlights the early Cold War and Franco using soft power to sell Spain to the United States through film productions, tourism, and public relations. Conversely, I argue that the later Cold War years saw the United States using soft power to sell American ideals to Spanish democracy to balance the problems caused by hard power.

Other works on U.S.-Spain focus on how the base agreements (hard power) helped fund educational exchanges (soft power), few go beyond this. Education, as Michael Hunt explains, offers a "powerful antidote to the long-prevalent core ideas of U.S. policy."<sup>23</sup> This argument works in the context of U.S.-Spain relations. I intend to elaborate on the educational exchanges by focusing on science and technology attempted to promote a positive image of the United States during a period of rampant anti-Americanism. Specifically, I complement the scholarship of Francisco Javier Rodríguez Jiménez. I continue to look at the growth of anti-Americanism in the 1970s and the attempt of the Fulbright program to utilize American Studies and educational exchanges

---

<sup>22</sup> *U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain: Selling Democracy?* eds. Francisco Javier Rodríguez Jiménez, Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, and Nicholas J. Cull (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

<sup>23</sup> Michael Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 193.

as soft power. However, I expand on his discussion of the Ford Foundation's role in Spain. Rodríguez only discusses the role of the NGO until the early 1970s, but I argue that the Foundation played a pivotal role in the educational reform in Spain and continued scholarly pursuits in the country though at a reduced rate. In addition, I differ from Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla's assertion that the United States gave up on Europeanization in Spain. He argues that the United States "passed the baton to Europe in the promotion of democracy in Spain."<sup>24</sup> I argue that the United States did not give up on democratization of Spain. The United States continued to use education, television, and human rights to promote democracy, but Spain's anti-Americanism helped with Europeanization.

In addition, I highlight how television played a role in cultural diplomacy with questions of national identity. Television was a fundamental aspect of cultural diplomacy in the 1970s and 1980s. Yet, few works on U.S. cultural diplomacy, the global 1970s, or even U.S.-Spain relations analyze how the medium was a vital part of cultural exchange between the two nations.<sup>25</sup> Those who work on the global 1970s often overlook the

---

<sup>24</sup> Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, "Estados Unidos, ¿soporte del franquismo o germen de la democracia?" in *La apertura internacional de España*, 267-8.

<sup>25</sup> For cultural diplomacy, see Walter Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997); Laura Belmonte, *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Nicholas J. Cull, *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); José Antonio Montero Jiménez, "Diplomacia pública, debate político e historiografía en la política exterior de los Estados Unidos (1938-2008)" in *Ayer 75* (2009): 63-95; *The United States and Public Diplomacy: New Directions in Cultural and International History* eds., Kenneth Osgood and Brian Etheridge (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2010); Antonio Niño, *La americanización de España* (Madrid: Catarata, 2012); Justin Hart, *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Rosendorf, *Franco Sells Spain to America; U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain; La Apertura Internacional de España: Entre el franquismo y la democracia (1953-1986)* eds. Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, Ricardo Martín de la Guardia, and Rosa Pardo Sanz (Madrid: Sílex, 2016); *El factor internacional en la modernización educativa, científica y militar de España* eds. Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, Pablo León Aguinaga, Oscar J. Martín García, Esther M. Sánchez Sánchez (Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2017).

impact of television. The edited volumes *The Shock of the Global* and *Reasserting America in the 1970s* alongside Thomas Borstelmann's *The 1970s* rarely, if even, discuss television in a decade that saw groundbreaking programming and expansion of news coverage. Other works discuss the exchange of the film industry. For example, Rosendorf focuses on how the Hollywood film industry used Spain to produce several motion pictures. Television was a growing medium during the Franco years; but, by the transition to democracy, it was an integral aspect of media for cultural exchange. As some scholars argue, television's capacity to reach larger numbers of the public than film causes one to consider "TV as [a] historian."<sup>26</sup> This work will examine how television, especially children's programming, provided the United States with a new venue for cultural diplomacy, and Spain with a way to establish a post-Franco national identity. These competing agendas further intensified U.S.-Spain relations.

My dissertation interacts with scholars of human rights in U.S. foreign relations as well. This study offers a case study on how human rights and NGOs affected U.S.-Spain relations. It does not explore the origins of human rights nor does it analyze U.S.-

---

For the global 1970s, see Bruce J. Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (New York: Free Press, 2001); Matthias Schulz and Thomas Schwartz, eds. *The Strained Alliance: U.S.-European Relations from Nixon to Carter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective* eds. Niall Ferguson, Charles S. Maier, Erez Manela, and Daniel J. Sargent (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010) Thomas Borstelmann, *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); N. Piers Ludlow, "The Real Years of Europe?: U.S.-Western European Relations during the Ford Administration," in *Journal of Cold War Studies* (2013); Barbara Zanchetta, *The Transformation of American International Power in the 1970s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Daniel J. Sargent, *A Superpower Transformed: The Remaking of American Foreign Relations in the 1970s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Luke Nichter, *Richard Nixon and Europe: The Reshaping of the Postwar Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); *Reasserting America in the 1970s: U.S. Public Diplomacy and the Rebuilding of America's Image Abroad* eds. Hallvard Notaker, Giles Scott-Smith and David J. Snyder (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

<sup>26</sup> H. Rosi Song, *Lost in Transition: Constructing Memory in Contemporary Spain* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016); Gary R. Edgerton, "Introduction" in *Television Histories: Shaping Collective Memory in the Media Age* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001).

Spain relations during the early Cold War (1953-1968).<sup>27</sup> Rather, this article examines the impact of human rights during a nation's transition from authoritarianism to democracy. The existing literature on human rights often provides the reader with a macro view of human rights and how it influenced policy decisions.<sup>28</sup> On some occasions, these volumes produce case studies that connect certain countries to the greater human rights struggle.<sup>29</sup> One work in particular is Sarah B. Snyder's *From Selma to Moscow: How Human Rights Activists Transformed U.S. Foreign Policy*. Snyder's monograph on the "long 1960s" provides several case studies on how social movements stimulated human rights. Nevertheless, even those works that do provide case studies are shockingly quiet on Spain. This country was a key player in the third wave of democracy and witnessed grassroots activism for the establishment of democracy and for an end to torture in Guardia Civil stations.

My work takes a similar course to Snyder by providing a case study on how human rights and NGOs affected U.S.-Spain relations. Further, this dissertation argues that human rights influenced U.S. foreign policy before the Jimmy Carter years. My work will provide an in-depth case study of how the United States reacted to human rights

---

<sup>27</sup> For select works on origins of human rights, see Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Elizabeth Borgardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005); Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007); *The Human Rights Revolution: An International History* eds. Akira Iriye, Petra Goedde, and William I. Hitchcock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

<sup>28</sup> See Kristen Sellars, *The Rise and Rise of Human Rights* (Stroud: Sutton, 2002); Mary Stuckey, *Jimmy Carter, Human Rights, and the National Agenda* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2008); Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012); Barbara Keys, *Reclaiming American Virtue: The Human Rights Revolution of the 1970s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014); Samuel Moyn, *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018).

<sup>29</sup> See Sarah Snyder, *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); *The Breakthrough: Human Rights in the 1970s*, eds. Jan Eckel and Samuel Moyn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Snyder, *From Selma to Moscow: How Human Rights Activists Transformed U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018).

from a transitioning democracy. As the country continued to transition, NGOs wanted a better human rights record from Spain, but the United States—even Carter—was willing to overlook human rights to maintain the status quo with the American bases.

The connected histories of U.S.-Spain relations, cultural diplomacy, and human rights illustrate how important the Spanish transition to democracy was. By focusing on U.S. smart power, I aim to inform the reader of this. Spain continues to be a guide on how to peacefully shift from dictatorship to democracy, and the United States endures as a country whose culture is transnational. However, the contentiousness of Cold War policies hindered the United States. It is of the utmost importance that those who read this understand that one country's use of soft power cannot undo the consequence of their hard power. As evidenced by the transfer of the *Guernica*, even the return of a prized piece of Spanish history could not improve the perception of Americans in Spaniards' eyes.

The story begins with the domestic impacts of U.S. hard power during the late Franco regime and transition to democracy. This allows the reader to understand how the development of anti-Americanism continued throughout the Franco regime and into the transition. I begin by illustrating how the U.S. administrations prepared for a post-Franco Spain and their approaches to maintain U.S. security interests. Yet, once the transition began, American leaders had to consider soft power elements to preserve a Spain that would work with them. In addition, U.S. hard power had an impact on American and Spanish publics. For Americans, Congress and the media voiced concerns about continuing to work alongside a dictatorship and concerns were raised that Juan Carlos would just continue Franco's legacy. However, Juan Carlos convinced the American



public that he was the bastion for constitutional monarchy and became a favorite of the American media. Yet, the American response to an attempted coup d'état on February 23, 1981 is an example of why Spaniards mistrusted the United States.

I explore the U.S. hard power that incensed the Spanish public in Chapter 2. I look specifically at how the United States used hard power to their advantage during the military base negotiations, exploited membership to NATO as a hard power inducement, and fought against Spain signing trade agreements with the European Community. The Franco regime faced isolation from the West due to his alliance with the Axis Powers during World War II, and the United States became their main ally during the Cold War. The U.S. administrations used their global position to tyrannize the military bases negotiations to benefit national security interests. To entice the Spanish side, the United States often used the possibility of granting Spain access to NATO in their negotiations, which the Franco regime desperately sought. Yet, when the transition to democracy occurred, the West began to reconsider Spain's position on the global stage. Spain voted to join the EC and then held a referendum to join NATO taking the hard power advantages away from the United States.

Chapter 3 examines how the USIA utilized public diplomacy as soft power to combat the anti-Americanism in Spain. Each presidential administration offered different approaches to public diplomacy with Spain. Nixon utilized the successful Apollo space program, Ford emphasized historical ties with the Bicentennial, Carter sought to promote human rights and democracy, and Reagan highlighted the importance of consumer rights in the new Spanish democratic economy. However, the USIA created a cohesive message to project to Spain. One of the central themes was to illustrate how important Spain was

to the creation of America and how the United States intended to return the favor with democracy. The subsequent chapters will provide a more detailed breakdown on soft power initiatives of American GOs and NGOs: educational exchanges, television, and human rights.

The Fulbright program and the Ford Foundation witnessed the implementation for educational reform and utilized educational exchanges to build U.S. soft power. Chapter 4 outlines the 1970 General Law of Education in Spain, which was an ambitious attempt at reform by the Franco regime. The effort was to modernize the educational system in Spain into something that resembled the American educational system. Both U.S. organizations helped legitimize the reform, but the Ford Foundation played a stronger role by sending a representative—Peter Fraenkel—to help and oversee the implementation of the General Law of Education. While the Fulbright program and Ford Foundation worked together to build soft power, they did so in different methods. Educational exchanges, especially through American Studies, and promotions of various subjects were how the Fulbright program developed soft power in Spain. For the Ford Foundation, they helped with the education reform efforts well into the 1970s, and supported research in Spain during the 1980s.

Chapter 5 surveys the wider availability of television sets in Spain allowed both the USIA and Children's Television Workshop to speak directly with the Spanish public. This technology became vital to the United States in the development of soft power through the media. The USIA provided Spanish state-run media, Televisión Española, with American news programs and documentaries that would provide the Spanish public with visuals that newspapers and radio could not. In addition, Children's Television

Workshop helped Spanish television fill the void of educational programs with a Spanish version of *Sesame Street*. While the show proved popular, behind the scenes issues and cultural misunderstandings nearly ended the show before the first season could end.

I conclude the story by examining the role of human rights during the Spanish transition to democracy. This is where GOs and NGOs were in direct conflict. The United States used human rights as a rhetorical tool to build soft power. Carter especially used Spain as an example of the triumph of democracy and human rights. Yet, NGOs like Amnesty International provided evidence of stripped civil liberties and torture occurring in Guardia Civil stations. The U.S. administrations were aware of this research but did not call out the practices in fear that it would upend military base negotiations. For example, the State Department told Ford that they were in possession of NGO research on human rights violations in Spain under Franco. Instead of pushing for change in Spain, the administration chose to find loopholes in Congressional acts that allowed them to continue base negotiations. This illustrates that no matter what soft power the United States could produce from human rights did not come from GOs but from NGOs who sought positive developments under the new Spanish constitutional monarchy.

The bilateral relationship was incredibly one-sided as the United States dominated Francoist Spain. However, the transition to democracy changed everything. Spain now had a working constitutional monarchy, their standing on the global stage rose, and their culture thrived. The United States, for the first time since before the Pact of Madrid, did not have the diplomatic high ground. Ultimately, one cannot investigate U.S.-Spain relations during the transition to democracy without exploring the role of smart power. The negative reaction to U.S. hard power precipitated the necessity for soft power. I

argue that the United States' use of smart power provided Spain with a democratic partner on the world's stage but did not help end anti-Americanism among the Spanish public. The hard power of base negotiations and history with Franco built an ardent foundation of anti-Americanism that even the soft power of GOs and NGOs could not alleviate.

## CHAPTER 1

### The Paternalism of Fascist Gunslingers: Leadership, Impressions, 23-F, and U.S. Hard Power

In the mid-1980s, walls of Spanish buildings became canvases for political murals including one featuring Picasso's *Guernica*. The recently arrived painting was part of anti-NATO and anti-American graffiti alongside hundreds of other murals across the nation. Other examples included Uncle Sam as God gifting Spain bombs, Don Quixote charging toward nuclear weapons adorned with the U.S. flag, Ronald Reagan as "a cowboy with a bullet through his head, as a rodeo rider astride a missile, and as a reptilian space invader from the television series 'V.'" <sup>1</sup> Reagan himself was greeted in Madrid with chants that included "NATO no—out with the bases!" and "Cowboy Reagan, fascist gunslinger!" <sup>2</sup> This anger towards the United States had long festered in Madrid before the 1980s. A State Department Briefing Paper analyzed positive effects of the 1976 Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the United States and Spain, but depicted a gloomy portrait of Spanish opinion of Washington. The paper posits that "a

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom Burns, "Spanish Demonstrators Protest Reagan Visit," *Washington Post* May 6, 1985.

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Herman, "Thousands in Spain Chant: 'Reagan go home!,'" *United Press International* May 5, 1985; Stanley Meisler, "The President in Europe," *Los Angeles Times* May 6, 1985.

combination of Spanish pride and Spanish sensitivity have what the Spanish consider U.S. paternalism, or lack of consideration on occasion [produced] strains in an otherwise excellent and mutually beneficial relationship.”<sup>3</sup> The State Department postulated that some within Spain believed the treaty, much like other U.S. dealings in Spain, occurred at a time of Spanish weakness. Instead, Spain supposed the commitments of the treaty was “a floor rather than a ceiling for U.S. assistance.”<sup>4</sup>

The Pact of Madrid in 1953 was one of several factors that led to Spanish animosity towards the United States. Though it was not a full-fledged alliance with Spain, the United States provided the Franco regime with funding to help their economy and military recover from worldwide ostracism following World War II. The anti-Americanism continued as the United States sought military bases in Spain and continued to irk Spaniards with each successive negotiation. The hard power of the United States—keeping control of the Spanish military bases—kept Franco in power for decades. This is how the Spanish public perceived Washington, which caused instability in the balance of smart power. As Nye details, there is “danger that the United States may obscure the deeper message of its values through arrogance.”<sup>5</sup> The perception of the United States continued into the Spanish transition to democracy and can be seen by how American leaders treated their Spanish counterparts, the perceptions of the American and Spanish public on each other, and the response to the attempted coup d’état in February 1981.

From the moment Franco designated Juan Carlos as his successor to Spain’s acceptance into NATO and the EC in 1986, the United States monitored the leadership of

---

<sup>3</sup> Briefing Paper, “U.S.-Spanish Relations,” August 1979; Spain, 9/79-1/80; box 72; Country Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; Jimmy Carter Presidential Library (hereby referred to as JCL).

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Nye, *Soft Power*, 32.

Spain. Each U.S. president had to approach leadership in a distinctive way. Richard Nixon had to appease the Franco regime to retain the military bases. As the transition began, Gerald Ford had to show support for the new monarch and political leaders while maintaining the status quo in U.S.-Spain relations. Jimmy Carter witnessed the introduction of new political parties into Spanish politics and spent most of his administration courting friendship with the Spanish Left. Reagan attempted to return U.S.-Spain relations to the early Cold War period by attempting to dominate Spain and the Spanish Left. Yet, the U.S. administrations that surveyed the transition had a shared hard power agenda. The United States was to support the Spanish transition, but not allow the key figures to jeopardize U.S. interest in the country. The hard power employed by the United States often influenced the decisions of these leaders, or the Spanish leaders felt the weight of U.S. hard power.

The hard power of the United States in Spain affected not only the Spanish public, but the American public as well. During the Franco regime, Americans and Congress were questioning the costs of America's international engagement. Many years at war in Southeast Asia led to "Vietnam fatigue" and called into question U.S. military bases abroad and support of authoritarian regimes. This distrust of Franco carried over, initially, with Juan Carlos. However, as the transition occurred, Americans saw him as a departure from Franco and supported the king. Yet, the Spanish public remained disillusioned with America despite having four different leaders during the transition. The response of U.S. leadership to the attempted coup d'état in 1981 offered an opportunity to help alleviate the negative aspects of U.S. hard power. The Spanish military nearly ended the peaceful transition to democracy. Although a televised speech by Juan Carlos and

communication failures within the military brought the coup to an end, Washington's response to the coup was not ideal. Secretary of State Alexander Haig argued it was an "internal matter" and declared that the United States did not plan to get involved. This led the Spanish to believe the United States had abandoned them.

### **U.S. Relationships with Spanish Leaders**

In 1969, Franco announced changes to his regime that would lay the foundation for a Francoist monarchy upon his death. He designated the return of the monarchy with Juan Carlos as his successor. However, Luis Carrero Blanco, the right-hand man of Franco, would take the reins of the government, not Juan Carlos, to carry on Franco's policies. Carrero Blanco gained more power in the early 1970s, while Juan Carlos achieved more publicity. Carrero Blanco filled cabinet positions with technocrats and hardliners—referred to as the bunker—but also made enemies within and outside of the bunker. Those within—such as Carlos Arias Navarro, the Mayor of Madrid—believed the economic and social changes in Spain during the 1960s rendered Francoism as obsolete. The supporters of modernization argued for an *aperturismo*, an "opening," of the Spanish government towards capitalism and social growth, but not a significant change.<sup>6</sup>

The Nixon administration noticed this slow crawl towards liberalism. National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger described the *aperturismo* as "gradual and relatively controlled;" and, with increased cohesion with Europe, "there is a fair chance of political

---

<sup>6</sup> Paul Preston, *The Triumph of Democracy in Spain* (London: Routledge, 1986), 16; Javier Tussell, *Spain: From Dictatorship to Democracy* (Chicester: Wiley Blackwell Publishing, 2011), 211.



stability, though almost certainly well to the left of the present situation.”<sup>7</sup> Yet, Kissinger argued that U.S.-Spain relations might experience some problems due to the *aperturismo*. He detailed how the Spanish factions “will try to use, or abuse, the U.S. in their domestic power struggle, and the military role in Spain could become a target for the frustrations and defeats of the contending factions.”<sup>8</sup> This is best illustrated in a letter Nixon and Kissinger received from Jose María de Areilza, Count of Motrico.<sup>9</sup> In the letter, Areilza depicted the current political climate of Spain. He conveyed a nation irritated with Franco’s dereliction toward a democratic form of government and lack of civil liberties. This caused some within Spain to turn on the regime, and those in power to be “more concerned about jockeying for position in the post-Franco succession than in movement toward a democratic system.”<sup>10</sup> Kissinger commented on Areilza’s picture of Spain and the prospects of the future as evidence of a growing concern for the post-Franco era. Kissinger warned that “we will be receiving more appeals for ‘benevolent neutrality’ from various contending groups and personalities,” and consider a posture for life after the dictator.<sup>11</sup> Kissinger’s belief became a central tenet of U.S. hard power for the rest of the transition. The United States should not fall prey to liberalizing efforts in Spain and should instead focus on the defensive interests.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume XLI, Western Europe; NATO, 1969-1972* eds. James E. Miller, Laurie Van Hook, and David S. Patterson (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2012), Doc. 303.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Areilza asked William F. Buckley to deliver the letter to Kissinger. Buckley delivered the letter and signed a separate letter, “your (unpaid) servant.” Kissinger replied, “You might be interested in knowing that your complimentary closing is one that my staff always uses in addressing me.” Exchange between William F. Buckley and Kissinger, November 23 and December 9, 1970; Spain Vol 3 Aug 1970-31 Dec 1971 (2); box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; Richard Nixon Library (hereby referred to as RNL).

<sup>10</sup> Kissinger to Nixon, December 23, 1970; Spain Vol 3 Aug 1970-31 Dec 1971 (2); box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

The Nixon administration believed it important to understand the man chosen to succeed Franco, and invited Juan Carlos to Washington in 1971 for an official state visit as a demonstration of U.S. interest in Spain after Franco. Further, the administration sought to “build up Juan Carlos’ position as an instrument of stability, although we fully realize that his role may not be an enduring one.”<sup>12</sup> One specific champion of Juan Carlos was Ambassador Robert C. Hill. One worker in the embassy, Jon David Glassman, recalled a story of Hill calling him into his office. Glassman concluded in a research paper that Juan Carlos would reign but not rule over Spain. Hill rebuffed Glassman’s analysis, and stated he had seen Juan Carlos at the Cortes with “the walk of a ruler” and with the blood “of Polish kings, of French kings—all strong rulers.”<sup>13</sup> Glassman recalled the absurdity of Hill’s analysis, but explained “notwithstanding the somewhat eccentric basis for his conclusions, Ambassador Hill was correct in asserting positive views about Juan Carlos’ potential.”<sup>14</sup> Though the embassy and the administration on his side, Juan Carlos soon faced an obstruction in Spain.

In a revealing conversation with Ambassador Hill, Juan Carlos believed the Franco bunker undercut his attempted strides at leadership. During the conversation, the prince explained that he did not want Foreign Minister Gregorio López-Bravo y Castro to “hold his elbow” throughout his visit because he wanted to impress the American people. He described this to Carrero Blanco, who then gossiped to López-Bravo that Juan Carlos had no confidence in him. López-Bravo confronted the prince about this and prepared to resign if necessary, but Juan Carlos expounded the situation to his foreign minister much

---

<sup>12</sup> “The Juan Carlos Visit: Perspectives,” January 22, 1971; Spain Prince Juan Carlos Visit Jan 1971; box 938; VIP Visits, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>13</sup> Interview with Jon David Glassman, December 19, 1997, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>14</sup> Interview with Glassman.

to his relief. However, Juan Carlos confided in Hill that “he could not have secrets or personal counsel with Carrero Blanco because the Vice President is not discreet.”<sup>15</sup> In this shocking exchange with Hill, Juan Carlos admitted to Hill that he thought he was no closer to being put on the throne. This highlights two major American anxieties: Juan Carlos would not be the future of U.S.-Spain relations, and the United States could lose their defensive posts in Spain by backing Juan Carlos.

The United States monitored the *aperturismo* and Juan Carlos for the next year and noticed a few trends and developments. Laborers, university students, professors, and the Catholic Church either continued being or became outspoken critics of the Franco regime, but his authority did not falter. Hill wrote that the succession of Juan Carlos provided Spain with its best opportunity for democracy. He expected “the pressures for liberalization will intensify after Juan Carlos takes office and that he will try to accommodate them in significant measure.”<sup>16</sup> In addition, Secretary of State William P. Rogers provided Nixon with a projection of U.S.-Spain relations for the next five years. Rogers explained that the major interest in Spain is to preserve the pro-Western orientation, which meant integrating Spain into NATO. However, the preconditions of Spanish acceptance to NATO will require “some liberalization of Spain’s institutions.”<sup>17</sup> For the *aperturismo* to take hold, Juan Carlos would need to lead from the center of the political spectrum. Rogers suggested the United States do a similar balancing act. He proposed the United States remain out of involvement with the succession to avoid

---

<sup>15</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, March 29, 1971; Spain (Ambassador R.C. Hill); box 65; Country Files – Europe, Henry A. Kissinger Office Files; RNL.

<sup>16</sup> “Impressions of Spanish Trends and Developments of Robert C. Hill,” January 12, 1972; Spain vol 4 Jan 1972-Jun 1974 (1); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>17</sup> “U.S. Policy Towards Spain,” April 25, 1972; Spain vol 4 Jan 1972-Jun 1974 (1); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

branding Juan Carlos and his supporters “as pawns of the United States.”<sup>18</sup> Rogers’s proposition received a test shortly afterwards.

On July 18, 1972, the Spanish post-Franco plan changed and jeopardized the reign of Juan Carlos. Franco published a new law stating the Vice President of the Government Carrero Blanco would succeed Franco’s position as President of Government upon his death or retirement. From the prior law, “the selection of the President of Government was left to the Chief of State Designate, Prince Juan Carlos, if Franco did not make a selection in his lifetime.”<sup>19</sup> In an evaluation of the new law, the United States considered the impact that this would have on U.S.-Spain relations. In the assessment entitled “Spain: Preparing Francoism After Franco,” the United States viewed Carrero Blanco as someone who would close off the *aperturismo* and “will doubtless disappoint those elements of the Spanish political spectrum who had hoped for at least a semblance of change after Franco.”<sup>20</sup> Further, the document describes how Juan Carlos, though not removed from being the future king, appeared ousted from the Franco succession. The new law deprived Juan Carlos and the Council of the Realm “of the opportunity of choosing the first post-Franco President of Government. ... Should Juan Carlos, in agreement with the Council of the Realm, wish to install a new President, he would have to dismiss an incumbent rather than simply fill a vacancy—undoubtedly, a difficult task in the circumstances likely to exist in the immediate post-Franco period.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> New Spanish Law on Presidential Succession; POL 15 - Succession 1973; box 14; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; National Archives II (hereby referred to as NARA).

<sup>20</sup> “Spain: Preparing Francoism After Franco,” July 24, 1972; POL 15 - Succession 1973; box 14; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

However, this changed suddenly with the assassination of Carrero Blanco on December 20, 1973. Three Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) members detonated explosives so powerful that they blew Carrero Blanco's car over the adjacent building.<sup>22</sup> ETA claimed responsibility in a French newspaper, saying they killed Carrero Blanco for three reasons: "to aid the fighting repression in Spain; to revenge the death of nine Basque militants at the hands of the Spanish government; and to eliminate the key, tough figure in that Government."<sup>23</sup> The administration circulated National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 193 after the ascension of Arias Navarro to Vice President of the Government. There was concern the transition from Carrero Blanco to Arias would affect the upcoming renegotiations of the base agreements. The State Department did not suspect major policy implications in the change of power in Spain. However, U.S. officials stated if Franco died before the renewal "the government in office at the time will be more subject to political influence from various sides than past governments have been and will thus be under increasing pressure to derive political benefits, rather than purely military benefits from the relationship with the U.S."<sup>24</sup> The Nixon administration believed it was important to conclude negotiations quickly and "obtain the longest possible extension of our rights to the facilities we now enjoy, provided the price we have to pay is reasonable."<sup>25</sup> This is another example of the Nixon administration focusing

---

<sup>22</sup> There is widespread belief in Spain that the CIA was involved in the assassination of Carrero Blanco. This has *not* been proven, but the belief stems from a number of coincidences. The explosion occurred a block away from the U.S. embassy in Madrid, the bombs were too powerful compared to previous ETA bombs, Kissinger had been in Madrid the previous day discussing issues with Carrero Blanco, and the ETA members involved never faced a trial.

<sup>23</sup> Kissinger to Nixon, December 21, 1973; Spain vol 4 Jan 1972-Jun 1974 (1); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>24</sup> "U.S. Policy Toward Spain NSSM 193," February 1974, folder: NSDM 268 – Renegotiation of Bases Agreement with Spain (3), box 54, Institutional Files – NSDMs, U.S. National Security Council, Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library (hereby referred to as GRFL).

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

solely on the base issue. They feared that a political changeover not in their favor would jeopardize their standing and leverage over Spain.

Franco died on November 20, 1975 and plunged both Spain and the United States into a period of transition. For Spain, the transition was obvious as the country sought to install a constitutional monarchy. For the United States, the transition was subtler. The Nixonian approach to U.S.-Spain relations was bygone after Franco's death. Washington could no longer dictate the base negotiations. Ford and Kissinger, now Secretary of State, could not focus solely on defense in negotiations with Spain now, but had to worry about the political stability of a new government. There were two fears that the United States had after Franco's death. The first was the concern of a possible military coup, and the second was the fear of retribution of anti-Francoists and a possible second civil war.<sup>26</sup> In order to mitigate these fears, Ford and Kissinger needed to rely less on hard power and more on smart power.

The Ford administration, particularly Kissinger, spotlighted three main interests in their reevaluation of U.S.-Spanish relations. First, the United States had to support a slow transition. Kissinger explained the United States "will play a stabilizing and supportive role" in the slowly paced democratic evolution within the Spanish kingdom.<sup>27</sup> Second, the United States remained committed to the security relationship, but "with a Spain more closely linked to the Atlantic Community."<sup>28</sup> Third, the Ford administration believed Juan Carlos would lead the Spanish transition, but the United States needed to support

---

<sup>26</sup> Interview with Clint Lauderdale, August 16, 1994, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>27</sup> Kissinger to Madrid Embassy, November 1975, folder: Spain – State Department Telegrams from SECSTATE – EXDIS, box 12, Country File, National Security Adviser: Presidential Files for Europe and Canada, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

whatever political party ascended. Kissinger wanted to use the country's "broad relationship with Spain to encourage and facilitate the evolutionary process."<sup>29</sup>

The stance of the Nixon and Ford administration during the Spanish transition showed that they ignored the five-year projection of Ambassador Hill in favor of hard power. Hill explained that for Juan Carlos to place Spain into the West, he would have to liberalize Spain and the United States would need to refrain from interfering. This was because Juan Carlos needed to shed the idea that he was a Franco or, by proxy, U.S. puppet. Yet, Nixon, Ford, and Kissinger took approaches to involve the United States in the Spanish transition. This included getting a "good deal" on the bases and being the international face of Spanish entrance to NATO. The reliance on keeping defensive interests ahead of Spanish interests show that the Nixon and Ford administrations placed a priority on hard power. For example, during his visit to Madrid in 1975, Ford and Kissinger spent copious amounts of time in meetings with Juan Carlos, but they devoted time to Franco as well. However, the time spent with the latter was mostly "posing for photo opportunities," and Ford made it clear he intended to speak primarily with the future king.<sup>30</sup>

The briefing book for Vice President Nelson Rockefeller's trip to Franco's funeral make clear Kissinger's three points of U.S.-Spain relations. Prepared by the State Department, there are three sections for talking points to understand the importance of the Spanish transition. Under the U.S.-Spanish relations talking points, the State Department emphasized the "200th anniversary of our democracy" as a path for Rockefeller to

---

<sup>29</sup> "The Spanish Succession," undated, folder: Spain, 1975 (6) WH, box 21, Country File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>30</sup> Liedtke, "Spain and the United States, 1945-1975," 242.

convey “our understanding and support” as Spain meets the challenge ahead.<sup>31</sup> The State Department also prepared Rockefeller for meeting other European dignitaries at the funeral. They implored Rockefeller to emphasize that Europeans should show realism and responsiveness for the transition to democracy. Realistic expectations meant avoiding a fast transition, and responsiveness included encouraging democratic evolution “without arousing Spanish resentment about foreign intervention.”<sup>32</sup> Finally, the State Department asserted that a successful transition hinged on the leadership of Juan Carlos. Triumph in Spain came down to “the extent to which it can attract the participation of the reform-minded, including the presently illegal opposition parties while not sparking direct conflict with the hard-line rightists.”<sup>33</sup>

In separate correspondence with Rockefeller, Kissinger and Ambassador to Spain Wells Stabler underscored the fears of domestic unrest in Spain during the transition. Kissinger explained that Juan Carlos had to steer the ship of the transition through the middle ground of the far right—“the stand-fast mentality of the old Falangists”—and the far left—“terrorists and ... a large, hostile communist party.”<sup>34</sup> In addition, Kissinger revealed that he was “a little more optimistic” about Juan Carlos’s ability to lead, but still a bit shocked at the prince’s uncertainty over key positions in his government.<sup>35</sup> Stabler believed that Juan Carlos was not in any immediate danger or trouble, but worried that the venom from the right or left could cause problems. Stabler clarified,

---

<sup>31</sup> “Rockefeller Briefing Book – The Vice President’s Mission to Spain,” November 1975; Vice President’s Mission to Spain, 1975; box 3; Nelson Rockefeller Vice Presidential Records; Series 19: Foreign Affairs and National Security; RAC.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> “Your Conversation in Spain,” November 21, 1975; Spain Substance File, 1975; box 1; Nelson Rockefeller Vice Presidential Records; Series 19: Foreign Affairs and National Security; RAC.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.



Juan Carlos has a difficult road ahead, in which he will seek to move without pause but without haste. In this he has considerable support, first of all from the mood of the Spanish people, but also from the Church, the establishment aperturistas, and, in a tacit sense at least, from the military. Since our earlier analysis one problem has become sharper, the threat from the right. There is entrenched opposition to apertura from the 'bunker' and from violence-prone rightist groups who will have to be brought under control, and their links with certain police elements severed, if the transition is to prosper. The threat to evolution, in the initial stages, is stronger on the far right than the far left (the Communist Party and the violence-prone groups such as the FRAP) whose real turn would come later on, once popular reaction to continued right wing intimidation set in. But of course the extreme left and extreme right, united in their opposition to democratic reforms, feed upon each other.<sup>36</sup>

The fear that domestic threats would derail Juan Carlos and the transition to democracy caused some stress within the Ford administration. Yet, this was not as concerning as being able to guide Juan Carlos through a nonviolent transition.

The greatest concern of the Ford administration was for Juan Carlos and Spain to take a slow and peaceful approach to the transition. If the new government felt forced to hastily changeover then it could have disastrous results for not only Spain but for the United States. Kissinger believed if Juan Carlos tried "to move from weakness or if he moves too fast, the lid will blow off."<sup>37</sup> In a conversation with Stabler, Kissinger explained,

I do not think the issue in Spain lies in accelerated democratization. I agree that there must be some democratization, but somehow we must find a position that lies between this and an Italian or a Portuguese situation. There must be authority, and people must know where we stand. I am not interested in the opinions of some of those fools in Congress. That is not our job. Our job is to lay down a policy. We must think this through, and I want to know where you think it is going to come out. . . . We just cannot have a democratization in a short time or the lid will blow off.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> "Spain at the Time of Transition," November 21, 1975; Spain Trip Message File, 1975; box 3; Nelson Rockefeller Vice Presidential Records; Series 19: Foreign Affairs and National Security; RAC.

<sup>37</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Kissinger and Stabler, November 28, 1975, folder: Spain, 1975 (7) WH, box 22, Country File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

In conversations with the new Spanish king, both Stabler and Kissinger stressed the importance of a gradual and smooth transition. Almost two weeks after Franco's death, Kissinger sent a telegram to Stabler that he was to deliver to Juan Carlos. The telegram gave details on how Juan Carlos should approach the transition at a deliberate pace and the path he should follow. Kissinger disclosed to Juan Carlos that he should assert himself, choose the President of the Cortes, place trusted allies in key Cabinet positions, and create a small private council "which can follow in detail everything that is happening, prepare studies and options for him, and act as his independent channel into the government, the military and the private sector."<sup>39</sup> This does not show direct influence from the United States on the Spanish decisions during the transition, but it does illustrate American concern for a prosperous democracy in Spain.

The first six months of 1977 were key to both the United States and Spain as both transitioned under new leadership. Juan Carlos and his appointed Prime Minister Adolfo Suárez swiftly enacted reforms to prepare Spain for their first democratic elections since the Civil War. Suárez formed the Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD, Union of the Democratic Center), a coalition comprised of Christian Democrats, social democrats, liberals, and some conservatives. They pardoned political prisoners, legalized trade unions, and allowed strikes. Suárez showed his willingness to work with the opposition by meeting with Felipe González, the leader of the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE, Spanish Socialist Workers' Party). Though the UCD was a recently formed party, the PSOE's origins came from the 1870s. The party went underground following Franco's victory in the Civil War, and many of its leaders faced exile, imprisonment, or

---

<sup>39</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1973-1976, Volume E-15, Part 2, Western Europe, 1973-1976*, ed. Kathleen B. Rasmussen, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2014), Document 210.

persecution. The PSOE continued to hold congresses in exile, and by the late 1960s, a wave of youths joined its ranks. The new members ousted leadership, removed Marxism from its doctrines, and moved the party back to Spain during the transition.<sup>40</sup> González ascended the party leadership, modeled himself after moderate left-wing leaders like Willy Brandt, François Mitterrand, and Pietro Nenni, and prepared the PSOE to regard itself as the party to lead Spain into the EC.<sup>41</sup> González and the PSOE became the prominent opposition to Suárez's UCD during the early years of the transition but other parties emerged or developed following the legalization of political parties.

One of the major issues discussed between the UCD and the PSOE was the legalization of the Partido Comunista de España (PCE, Communist Party of Spain). Following the Spanish Civil War, the leadership of the PCE went underground or forced into exile. The PCE remained one of the best organized opposition parties during the Franco regime. Initially led by Dolores Ibárruri, the PCE obeyed directives from Moscow—they supported the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956—and strongly supported the use of guerrilla warfare. However, the ascension of Santiago Carrillo to party leadership in 1960 brought a host of changes to the PCE. Under Carrillo, a policy of national reconciliation became the PCE's slogan, and they began to form “clandestine organizations that incorporated workers, students, women, and neighbors in an all-out societal effort to fight” the Franco regime.<sup>42</sup> Further, Carrillo distanced the PCE away from the Soviet Union and towards Eurocommunism. The PCE were sharply critical of

---

<sup>40</sup> Victor Alba, *Transition in Spain: From Franco to Democracy* trans. Barbara Lotito (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1978), 239.

<sup>41</sup> Viñas, “Breaking the Shackles,” 258; Crespo MacLennan, 157.

<sup>42</sup> Tussell, 165; Omar G. Encarnación, *Spanish Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), 52.

the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and openly promoted a “pact for freedom”—the restoration of liberal democracy.<sup>43</sup>

González demanded the legalization of the PCE in an early meeting, but Suárez warned that authorizing the PCE would solidify the growing resentment within the military.<sup>44</sup> However, Suárez decriminalized the PCE in April 1977 just before the first elections occurred. The opening of political parties, especially the PCE, proved decisive in the Spanish transition as it allowed for fair elections.<sup>45</sup> In June 1977, the UCD won the first free elections since before the Civil War but was just shy of an absolute majority. A second election occurred in 1979 with similar results of Suárez and the UCD winning but not the majority. Carter and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance wrote a congratulatory message to Suárez following the election in 1977. Carter toasted Suárez by writing “I am confident that, with determination and cooperation, Spain will meet the challenges that lie ahead. You can count on our support in those efforts.”<sup>46</sup>

Suárez understood that he needed to cooperate with the opposition despite the UCD holding the majority. All parties needed to work together to continue the transition. The manifestation of this political participation was the Moncloa Pacts, named after the Palace of Moncloa in Madrid where the prime minister resides. Most of the agreements committed economic and political affiliation between the UCD and the opposition—the PSOE and the PCE. The parties “agreed on a comprehensive economic program including limitations on wages, currency devaluation, monetary policy, increased public

---

<sup>43</sup> Tussell, 245.

<sup>44</sup> Preston, *Triumph of Democracy*, 100-101.

<sup>45</sup> Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996), 97.

<sup>46</sup> Telegram from Jimmy Carter to Adolfo Suarez, June 25, 1977; CO 145 Executive 1/20/77-12/31/79; box CO-54; White House Central File (hereby referred to as WHCF); JCL.

investment, restrictions on social security, tax reform, trade union activities, control of nationalized industries, and other matters.”<sup>47</sup> Suárez could not avoid the Moncloa Pacts if the transition were to be successful. Historian Paul Preston stresses the pacts were “the only way, short of revolutionary measures, of confronting the inextricably linked problems of the burden of Francoist economic imbalance and the unfavorable international situation.”<sup>48</sup> However, the Moncloa Pacts provided more than just an agreement. It supplied potent symbolism of national reconciliation to resonate through the following year with the establishment of a constitution.<sup>49</sup>

The Cortes approved the Constitution on October 31, 1978, a year after the Moncloa Pacts. The Spanish public voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Constitution on a referendum held on December 6, which is a national holiday in Spain—el día de la constitución. The new constitution abolished the death penalty and presented a new higher court for political crimes. The two largest political parties, the UCD and PSOE, crafted the majority of the document despite various political groups and the two chief autonomous regions—Catalonia and Basque—participating in the drafting.<sup>50</sup> An analysis of the involvement of Catalans and Basques in the formulating of the Constitution shows how the UCD and PSOE dominated the writing. Catalan nationalists played a role as mediators while asking for an organization within the Spanish state, but the Basque nationalists demanded sovereignty, which proved unacceptable to other writers.<sup>51</sup> The text of the Constitution did not meet the approval of extremists on the left or right, but the

---

<sup>47</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 166.

<sup>48</sup> Preston, *Triumph of Democracy*, 137.

<sup>49</sup> Laura Desfor Edles, *Symbol and Ritual in the New Spain: The Transition to Democracy after Franco* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 9; Linz and Stepan, 90.

<sup>50</sup> Tussell, 296.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

general population approved of the document.<sup>52</sup> The Moncloa Pacts and the Constitution played a vital role in the Spanish transition to democracy, and the credit often goes to those who wrote the document—los padres de la Constitución.

The elections, Moncloa Pacts, and Constitution are significant to the Spanish transition, and brought to fruition by the work of Suárez. Historians often cite Suárez's leadership as significant to the Spanish transition and it's impossible to dismiss this view. The common denominator in the early transition was his attempts at political cooperation and coalition building. According to historian John F. Coverdale, Suárez used a two-tiered strategy to form a political coalition. He arranged a center-right coalition "which provided a broad enough plurality to permit him to form a cabinet," and he formed a broader coalition for the writing of the Constitution that allowed him enough control to make the document long lasting.<sup>53</sup> Another historian, Omar G. Encarnación, sees Suárez working with the opposition as a requirement because he did not have an absolute majority, much to the chagrin of the far right and the military.<sup>54</sup> However, it is foolhardy to believe Suárez lacked options and was forced to operate with the opposition. He could have chosen not to include the ideas of the opposition in the transition and taken a more Francoist hardline stance. Though he played a pivotal role in a smooth transition, Suárez's popularity began to falter because of several issues that ranged from terrorism and crime to economic issues such as inflation and unemployment. Suárez always had an approval rating at "a majority," but an October 1979 poll showed the Prime Minister

---

<sup>52</sup> Preston, *Triumph of Democracy*, 139.

<sup>53</sup> John F. Coverdale, *The Political Transformation of Spain After Franco* (New York: Praeger, 1979), 140.

<sup>54</sup> Omar G. Encarnación, *Democracy Without Justice in Spain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 70.

“retained the backing of a 43 to 35 percent plurality.”<sup>55</sup> The economic downturn was a prevalent example that contributed to the questioning of Suárez’s leadership, even after guiding Spain to a smooth transition from dictatorship to democracy.

The Carter administration monitored the economic situation closely in Spain. Spain faced a major dilemma due to the economic shocks from Middle Eastern oil that Suárez exacerbated. This occurred in tandem with three other economic problems in Spain: inflation, deteriorating foreign balance, and unemployment. The declining labor market coupled with unemployment hurt the working population, particularly the younger age groups, with an average of 5 percent.<sup>56</sup> Suárez faced difficulty in short-term economic policy because of the ever-changing political outlook during the transition. There was one area that the United States highlighted as one of the more important areas for Spain to look at—banking. Stabler explained in a telegram regarding monetary and credit policies in Spain that the country needed to reform the private banking system. Stabler detailed how Spain’s current banking system and structure “as it now exists is inefficient and is the subject of widening public discussion.”<sup>57</sup> In September 1977, the Bank of Spain initiated a biweekly auction system to provide credits to private banks in need of increased liquidity. Before this, the Bank of Spain gave credit to private banks at fixed, low rates for terms of one day to several months. The first action resulted in

---

<sup>55</sup> “Spanish Public Opinion on International and Domestic Issues,” June 10, 1980; S-27-80; box 42; Special Reports, 1953-1997; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>56</sup> “Economic and Development Review Committee, 1976-1977 Annual Review,” May 16, 1977; Spain; box 462; International Financial and Economic Development’s Country Files, Records of the Council of Economic Advisers; JCL.

<sup>57</sup> Wells Stabler to Department of State, June 22, 1977; Spain; box 462; International Financial and Economic Development’s Country Files, Records of the Council of Economic Advisers; JCL.

interest rates (12.75 percent and higher) much higher than drop-by-drop rates (7 to 8 percent).<sup>58</sup>

This banking reform impressed the United States, and they believed Suárez and the UCD made great strides. Vice President for Economic Affairs Enrique Fuentes Quintana especially impressed the Carter administration. In a message on television in December 1977, Fuentes expounded on Spain's economic challenges. He expressed optimism "that measures approved by the Moncloa Pacts will be successful if adhered to," but warned that premature reactivation of the economy "would lead to insolvency and ruin."<sup>59</sup> Nevertheless, the economy continued its downward spiral, which provided González and the PSOE with another potent message to defeat Suárez and the UCD. Preston explains that the PSOE used a public and private method to attack Suárez and the UCD. In public, PSOE members engaged in merciless criticism of the prime minister and his party for their failure of the economy. In private, the Socialists attempted to undermine Suárez by "continuing negotiations with the social democrat wing of the UCD" to break up the coalition party.<sup>60</sup> The beginnings of the Spanish transition provided the Carter administration with several issues to discuss for U.S.-Spain relations.

The first years of the transition illustrated issues in U.S.-Spain relations facing the Carter administration that previous presidents did not encounter. First, the legalization of political parties in Spain, especially those of the Left, provided the United States with political figures that were not affiliated with Franco. Members of the UCD and Juan

---

<sup>58</sup> "Spanish Economic Program Another Key Step in the Reform of the Financial System," September 9, 1977; Spain; box 462; International Financial and Economic Development's Country Files, Records of the Council of Economic Advisers; JCL.

<sup>59</sup> "Economic Program Begins to Show Results," December 13, 1977; Spain; box 462; International Financial and Economic Development's Country Files, Records of the Council of Economic Advisers; JCL.

<sup>60</sup> Preston, *Triumph of Democracy*, 169.



Carlos had ties to Franco, unlike González and the PSOE. Second, the Moncloa Pacts, the Constitution, and elections signaled the first evidence that Spain was moving forward with the transition. Third, Spain, like many other nations, fell prey to the economic hardships of the 1970s. Carter, unlike Nixon and Ford, had an opportunity to change the direction of their bilateral relationship with Spain for the first time since the Pact of Madrid.

National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and the State Department worked on an approach to the development and expansion of the PSOE and the PCE. Both Brzezinski and the State Department placed the developing Leftist politics in Spain within a broader network of Left political parties in Europe. Brzezinski emphasized how previous administrations avoided contacts with the opposition for fear of agitating Franco. He argued this “rigid position seems counterproductive,” especially in Spain, and “a more flexible attitude should be issued” for the PSOE and PCE.<sup>61</sup> Though he was not proposing the United States support the accession of communist parties, Brzezinski believed Carter should not immediately reject relations with that party. The State Department researched the rise of influence of communist parties in Italy, France, Portugal, and Spain before Carter’s tenure in Washington began. They revealed Spanish communists were more liberal than their Italian counterparts, and warned that the return of the leadership from exile “could precipitate a struggle for control.”<sup>62</sup> Once Suárez legalized political parties, the Carter administration overcompensated by courting PSOE members for official visits to the United States. From 1978 to 1980, eight prominent

---

<sup>61</sup> “Foreign Policy Priorities, November 3, 1976-May 1, 1977,” November 3, 1976; Transition: Foreign Policy and Defense Matters, 10-11/76; box 41; Subject Files, Plains Files; JCL.

<sup>62</sup> “Western Europe Plans,” Transition: State and Defense Options Papers [2], 11/76, Western Europe; box 41; Subject Files, Plains Files; JCL.

members of the PSOE traveled to the United States, and some met or proposed meetings with Carter administration officials. In January 1980, the State Department asked four prominent Spanish socialists who received United States International Communications Agency (ICA, new moniker for the USIA) grants to meet with Carter the day after Suárez's official state visit. The State Department argued the meeting would be timely "before a group of influential socialists who have (up until now) taken a negative view of Spanish membership in NATO."<sup>63</sup> These meetings and courting of the PSOE seemed to illustrate the United States spurning the Spanish prime minister.

Suárez hoped to make his first official visit to the United States as prime minister before the elections of 1977. However, the State Department initially turned down his visit until Juan Carlos pled with the White House.<sup>64</sup> Stabler wrote to Brzezinski to implore the president to meet with Suárez during his visit to North America. He stressed how beneficial the visit was for both Suárez and Carter to affirm support for the transition. Stabler said that he "would strongly recommend that the President agree to offer a small working lunch for Prime Minister Suárez following a short office call. ... The ceremonial aspects of it could be limited to the barest minimum, if not altogether eliminated. I realize that Suárez's inability to speak English is a draw-back, but I would hope this aspect not to be a disqualifying one as far as a working lunch is concerned."<sup>65</sup> The meeting occurred on April 29, 1977. Suárez expected a discussion on Carter's restriction on exporting enriched uranium, and the impact this had on the Spanish-U.S.

---

<sup>63</sup> Memorandum from Jim Rentschler to David Aaron, January 9, 1980; Spain, 9/79-1/80; box 72; Country Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL. The PSOE members were Alfonso Guerra, Enrique Baron, Javier Guerrero, and Emilio Menendez del Valle.

<sup>64</sup> Powell, "The United States and Spain," 243.

<sup>65</sup> Wells Stabler to Zbigniew Brzezinski, March 28, 1977; Spain: 1977; box 48; Office Files, NSA Brzezinski Materials; JCL.

Treaty on Nuclear Cooperation signed in 1974.<sup>66</sup> However, the language barrier did affect the timing of the meeting as it only lasted an hour, and it left Suárez disappointed with the United States. This was his last official visit as Prime Minister though he would return on other occasions. This overcorrection to influence the Spanish Left threatened to derail U.S.-Spain relations.

However, in 1980, Suárez planned a private visit to the United States. By this point, Carter's opinion of the Spanish prime minister reversed course. During the 1980 visit, the two leaders met to discuss a variety of world events such as the situation in the Middle East, Latin America, and Western defense. Carter wrote to Suárez after his return to the United States asking him that while he visited the Middle East "to pursue the idea we discussed last month of consulting personally on major foreign policy questions. ... I am sure your talks in the countries you visit will be useful in obtaining a better perspective on Arab attitudes to these questions."<sup>67</sup> In addition, Carter believed Suárez to be an important intermediary between the United States and Latin America. As he wrote in his diary after meeting Suárez in 1980, Carter "underestimated Spain's importance" in policy work in Latin America.<sup>68</sup> The obvious transformation in the opinion on Suárez was due to the impending negotiations over the soon-to-expire treaty for the Spanish bases in 1981. Though Brzezinski and the State Department initially believed they could use soft power during the Spanish transition, the Carter administration soon relied on similar

---

<sup>66</sup> "Suarez to Visit Mexico, U.S.," April 15, 1977; 4/29/77 Suarez (Spain) Visit: 3-4/77 (17); box 11; Schecter/Friendly (Press Files), NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>67</sup> Jimmy Carter to Adolfo Suárez, February 9, 1980; Spain, King Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia 2/15/80; box 12; VIP Visit Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>68</sup> Jimmy Carter, *White House Diary* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2010), 391. Eusebio Mujal-León argued that the Carter administration refused to consider Suárez as a serious intermediary between the United States and Spain. Eusebio Mujal-León, "Rei(g)ning in Spain" in *Foreign Policy* 51 (Summer 1983), 15.

inducements of hard power from previous administrations—base negotiations, NATO, and admission into the EC.

Though Carter worked toward courting better relations with the Spanish Left, Reagan mistrust of González and the PSOE nearly derailed U.S.-Spain relations. Much like the United States transitioned from Carter to Reagan, Spain saw Leopoldo Calvo-Sotelo succeed Suárez. To further complicate matters, the base negotiations concluded under the rule of Calvo-Sotelo, but the election of González and the PSOE delayed the signing of the agreement. Ambassador Terence Todman explains the tensions relationship between Reagan and González, explaining that the PSOE thought “this right-wing Republican is coming in, and the Republicans thinking of these left-wing Socialists out there.”<sup>69</sup> In addition, there appeared to be a lack of understanding of Spain by the Reagan administration. Todman details a visit by Secretary of State George P. Schultz to Madrid. After reading the briefing book for Schultz, Todman noticed that Washington disregarded his comments or changed his words. He exclaimed to Schultz, “Mr. Secretary, you’ve been set up for total disaster by what they’ve put in your [briefing] book.”<sup>70</sup> Todman salvaged a disastrous meeting after discussing last minute changes for Schultz before a meeting in Madrid.

While Carter met with Gonzalez during his time as opposition leader, Reagan did the same with Manuel Fraga Iribarne. The administration received a few letters asking for the president to meet with the Alianza Popular (AP) leader either in a meeting or for a photo opportunity. Aline Griffith, Countess of Romanones and a friend of Nancy Reagan, wrote the First Lady in the hopes that her husband would meet with Fraga. Griffith

---

<sup>69</sup> Interview with Terence A. Todman, June 13, 1995, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

stressed that a meeting between Reagan and Fraga would provide “psychological strength to people of the right in Spain” and to avoid another military takeover.<sup>71</sup> Retired Navy officer Alan Brown wrote a number of letters to Nancy Reagan in the hopes of persuading the Reagans to meet Fraga during Juan Carlos and Sofía’s visit to the United States. Brown insisted that Reagan and Secretary of State Haig meet “an intelligent leading Spanish politician of the Center Right,” and claimed that Fraga was “one of the few Spanish who can save Spain from going Socialist in the 1983 elections.”<sup>72</sup> While the Reagans received these letters, the administration had yet to receive either Juan Carlos or Calvo-Sotelo for official visits. The administration denied the requests to meet Fraga not only because it was against protocol, but also because it would be viewed “as interference in the Spanish internal political situation.”<sup>73</sup> The administration appeared to have learned from Carter’s mistake in courting political opposition to the United States before meeting with political leadership.

While those outside the administration believed he should be allying with right-leaning politicians, Reagan eventually found a good working relationship with González despite initial concerns. In an examination of the PSOE’s first six months in control of Spain in 1982-83, the United States applauded González for maintaining moderation in every field despite a platform that leaned to the left. Michael E. Parmly, a member of the State Department, prepared a document that examined González’s short time in office, which highlighted economic, military, and socio-religious policies. Parmly claimed that

---

<sup>71</sup> Countess of Romanones to Michael Deaver, May 19, 1981; 018867-032999; box 176; White House Office of Records Management (hereby referred to as WHORM) Subject File, CO 145; Ronald Reagan Library (hereby referred to as RRL).

<sup>72</sup> Alan Brown to Nancy Reagan, September 10, 1981; 043000-045999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL. Alan Brown to Nancy Reagan, November 30, 1981; 043000-045999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

<sup>73</sup> L. Paul Bremer to Richard V. Allen, June 8, 1981; 018867-032999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

the Spanish Prime Minister's "prudence thus far demonstrates his sensitivity to the political climate."<sup>74</sup> In addition, Ambassador Thomas Enders voiced his approval of González as the prime minister especially regarding foreign policy. Enders demonstrated that González "emphasized Spain's western democratic loyalties and generally avoided playing to the ideological preferences of the Spanish Left."<sup>75</sup> Coincidentally, this change in perception of González occurred as he and the PSOE began reconsidering entrance to NATO and proposed a referendum for approval. However, this misunderstanding and mistrust between the United States and Spain intensified after an attempted coup d'état in Spain on February 23, 1981.

### **The Black Legend and Anti-Americanism**

The American perception of Francoist Spain was a negative one in the late 1960s and early 1970s. This opinion of Spain goes back to the Spanish-American War in 1898 and the "black legend." As historian Kristin L. Hoganson points out, a fear of weakened manhood and national decay lead to some Americans to perceive the Cuban revolt against Spain in 1895 through a gendered lens. Cubans became "heroes and heroines of a romance novel," the Spanish became the rapists, and the United States became the chivalrous knights to save Cuba's honor.<sup>76</sup> Into the twentieth-century, Americans continued this prejudice of Spain. Historian David F. Schmitz describes how American officials in the 1920s and 1930s viewed Spain as a "backward nation, still governed by medieval institutions of the monarchy and the church, which prevented the political and

---

<sup>74</sup> "Spain: The Risks of Socialist Moderation," June 23, 1983; Spain - 1983 (May 1983-June 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices; White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>75</sup> "Meeting of King Juan Carlos with the President, December 8," November 25, 1983; Spain - 1983 (November 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices; White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>76</sup> Kristin L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 51.

economic developments that had advanced in the rest of Western Europe and accounted for the decline of Spain's empire, its easy defeat in the Spanish-American War, and the current poverty.”<sup>77</sup>

Though the Nixon administration hoped to change this perception due to the president's friendliness with Franco, U.S. officials worried that popular fatigue over the Vietnam War and budgetary battles would hinder 1969 base negotiations. The optics of the Nixon administration networking with Francoist Spain and burgeoning domestic antiwar activism troubled U.S. politicians who questioned whether the United States should be working with an authoritarian regime to retain military bases abroad while continuing the unpopular war in Southeast Asia. The State Department warned the administration to anticipate “possible flak” by negotiating “on generous terms with a government which has recently clamped down on civil liberties.”<sup>78</sup> There were also fears within the administration of the upcoming Symington Subcommittee.

In January 1969, Stuart Symington formed the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad. This subcommittee aimed to research U.S. foreign military commitments, one of which was Spain. Ambassador Hill and General David A. Burchinal expressed Spain's desire for a swift conclusion to the negotiations to avoid any conflicts with the Symington Subcommittee hearings. However, the State Department felt that “the effects of the Symington Subcommittee hearings will be bad regardless of when the negotiations

---

<sup>77</sup> Schmitz, 98.

<sup>78</sup> Arthur Hartman to George Landau, March 7, 1969; DEF 15-Spanish Base Negotiations Memoranda to the President 1969; box 7; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

occur.”<sup>79</sup> The State and Defense Departments jointly conducted a base study that further alarmed the Nixon administration. Richard V. Allen, a foreign policy coordinator for Nixon, wrote to Kissinger and Deputy National Security Advisor Haig to suggest they give Symington a factual description of the base agreement instead of the base study, “if, indeed, we are to give him anything.”<sup>80</sup> Allen clarified that the base study will denote “much material to charge the administration with expanding commitments beyond those approved by Congress. It will also have a basis to press us to close bases because the Study Group implies that they are not needed.”<sup>81</sup> Haig believed it was best to give the Symington subcommittee a copy because they would get it one way or another. Further, a National Security Council staffer warned Kissinger to “anticipate a great deal of adverse publicity to accompany” the Symington hearings later in 1970.<sup>82</sup>

Though the U.S. Congress appeared to be turning on the bases, editorials in newspapers showed this already happened to some of the American public. A *New York Times* editorial argued against the renewal of the U.S. bases in Spain because “it is too high a price to pay for four bases that are obsolete and in any case could be replaced by other arrangements. The 10,000 American troops currently stationed in Spain have no business propping up regimes like Franco’s.”<sup>83</sup> Foreign Minister Fernando María Castiella y Maíz met with Ambassador Hill and brought this particular editorial and a few others. Hill noted that Castiella “may have wished mainly to register with me his

---

<sup>79</sup> Kissinger to Nixon, January 3, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>80</sup> Richard V. Allen to Kissinger and Alexander Haig, March 4, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>81</sup> Richard V. Allen to Kissinger and Morton Halperin, March 4, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>82</sup> J. F. Lehman to Kissinger, December 3, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>83</sup> “Propping Up Franco” *New York Times*, 6/18/69.



Government's unhappiness over the recent unfavorable publicity in the American press; he did not seem really to expect, or want an answer from me."<sup>84</sup>

There were other instances of Spain voicing their displeasure over the optics of the negotiations. Some within Spain, including Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs Ramon Sedo Gomez, expressed displeasure with the "summoning" of Castiella for a last-minute visit to the United States. Sedo argued that while Spain received political, economic, and military benefits from these agreements, the Spanish in and out of government understand they are in "an unequal partnership with [the] U.S."<sup>85</sup> Spanish diplomat Nuño Aguirre de Cárcer to Kissinger added:

Logically, the Spanish people have a sense of disillusion and disappointment with this situation, and this has given rise to a trend towards disengagement, a general desire not to incur in risks on behalf of a collective system of defense that does not accept us; a wish to see a reduction in the American military presence, down to those levels and requirements which are strictly necessary for US and Western security.<sup>86</sup>

The two sides continued working on an agreement through the negative public reaction.

Yet, after the death of Franco, Americans still had reservations regarding his successor, Juan Carlos. The American media, especially *Time* magazine, questioned the competency and loyalty of Juan Carlos. In an article from a 1962 cover story on Don Juan (Juan Carlos's father) being Franco's successor, *Time* focused on the youth of Juan Carlos and how he cut his honeymoon short with Queen Sofia to introduce her to Franco.<sup>87</sup> The belief was that the Spanish prince was just a stooge for Franco and Don

---

<sup>84</sup> Robert Hill Memorandum of Conversation with Foreign Minister, June 18, 1969; POL 15-1 - Political Affairs & Rel. Head of State-Franco Spain 1969; box 10; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>85</sup> McAuliffe, "USG-GOS Bases Negotiations," March 26, 1969; US-Spanish Base Negotiations thru June 1969; box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>86</sup> Nuño Aguirre de Cárcer to Kissinger, April 1, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>87</sup> "Spain: Everyone's Waiting," *Time* June 22, 1962.

Juan may be the post-Franco savior of Spain. American media uneasiness continued in *Time*'s November 1975 issue "After Franco." Much of the cover story discussed the failing health of the dictator and the competing factions vying for control of Spain. *Time* questioned whether Juan Carlos—whom they refer to as "The Prince as Sleeping Beauty"—could manage the transition. The article argues that while Spaniards still had memories of the Civil War, the only way for Spain to transition peacefully "depends largely on whether Juan Carlos can convince Franco's long-suppressed political opponents that he is more than a programmed appendage of the old regime."<sup>88</sup>

The public interest in Spanish domestic politics and the transition rose after Juan Carlos assumed the throne. Initially, the press coverage from sources such as *Time* led the American public to be apprehensive of Juan Carlos because of concerns as to whether he was Franco's puppet or would integrate a constitutional monarchy. These concerns led to the formation of committees aimed at promoting human rights and democracy in Spain including the Ad Hoc Committee for a Democratic Spain, the Madison Committee for a Democratic Spain, the U.S. Committee for a Democratic Spain, and the American Committee for Iberian Freedom. These groups had a wide range of memberships, utilized comparable methods of advocating for Spanish democracy, and continually held the monarchy to a high standard of human rights promotion in Spain.

The Ad Hoc Committee consisted of prominent historians, political scientists, scientists, economists, playwrights, novelists, publishers, political activists, religious leaders, a university president, and a former United Nations ambassador.<sup>89</sup> This assembly

---

<sup>88</sup> "After Franco: Hope and Fear," *Time* November 3, 1975, 26.

<sup>89</sup> This list includes the following who signed the document sent to the White House: William Shirer, Barbara Tuchman, Max Ascoli, Edward F. Albee, Edward J. Bloustein, Kay Boyle, James MacGregor Burns, Henry Steele Commager, Cass Canfield, Max Delbruck, John R. Everett, Elinor S. Gimbel, Arthur

believed it was the United States' obligation "to help assure freedom in Spain without threat of the kind of violence which could lead to a new civil war."<sup>90</sup> Some committees formed before Juan Carlos became king such as the Madison Committee. Located in Madison, Wisconsin, this group highlighted the human rights violations of the Franco regime, and decried the United States for perpetuating the regime and funneling money for defense in Spain. Following the executions in 1975 and the debate over promoting the base agreement to a treaty, the Madison Committee wrote to its members that all "American troops and arms must be removed from Spain. There must be no interference in the internal affairs of Spain."<sup>91</sup>

Two other committees utilized writing campaigns to air their grievances with the United States. The group with the broadest membership was the U.S. Committee for a Democratic Spain, which had chapters in northern and southern California, Seattle, Cleveland, Boston, and Chicago. The U.S. Committee urged their Congressmen not to sign the treaty. In one of their newsletters, they argued "it is vital that the [Congressional] hearings bring out all understandings accompanying the treaty if the American people are to avoid another Vietnam-type involvement."<sup>92</sup> Another committee even went so far as to write a letter to Juan Carlos seeking an audience with him during his visit to the United States. Joseph Lash and James Loeb, the American Committee for Iberian Freedom

---

J. Goldberg, Eric F. Goldman, Donald S. Harington, Pendleton Herring, Alfred Kazin, Arthur Kornberg, Polykarp Kusch, Archibald MacLeish, Arthur Miller, Otto Nathan, Gerar Piel, and George Wald. See Ad Hoc Committee for a Democratic Spain, undated, folder: Spain, 1976 (1) WH, box 22, Country File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Madison committee for a Democratic Spain newsletter, October 1, 1975; folder: 1975; box 9; National Section Memos, 1964-1983; Executive Director's Files, 1964-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; Columbia University Library (hereby referred to as CUL).

<sup>92</sup> U.S. Committee for a Democratic Spain newsletter, April 1976; American Committee for Iberian Freedom: Background Information; box 170; Administrative Files; New York Office; Spanish Refugee Aid Records; New York University Library (hereby referred to as NYUL).

chairman and director respectively, wrote that “as supporters of human rights, we find it disappointing” that Spain had not legally recognized political parties, nor was there any universal suffrage, free trade unions, or amnesty for political prisoners.<sup>93</sup> Though each group had different members and methods, they all had a similar goal. Each committee wanted Spain to integrate democracy as fast as possible against the specter of Franco and do so peacefully to avoid another catastrophic civil war.

As the transition continued, media coverage of Juan Carlos and the transition itself grew more positive. *Time* magazine began portraying Juan Carlos as a competent leader. As part of an article on the rise of prominence of European monarchs, Juan Carlos received glowing—though slightly backhanded—reviews from the magazine. The articles explained that though the Spanish King was “criticized for his seeming lethargy during the first three months of his reign,” Juan Carlos received praise for his response to riots in Barcelona by traveling to various Spanish regions to calm the tensions.<sup>94</sup> Further, *New York Times* bureau chief James M. Markham wrote a complementary piece on the Spanish king after the attempted coup d’état in February 1981. He commended Juan Carlos for cultivating “the image of a populist monarchy, shorn of pomp and devoid of scandal and controversy,” and for consistently proclaiming the need for a united Spain.<sup>95</sup>

This image of Juan Carlos in the American media changed over time, but the Spanish image of the United States did not. Anti-Americanism was prevalent in Spain in the early twentieth century. As historian Francisco Javier Rodríguez Jiménez describes, one of the most typical points of anti-Americanism was “the supposed lack of culture,

---

<sup>93</sup> Joseph Lash and James Loeb to King Juan Carlos, June 2, 1976; American Committee for Iberian Freedom; box 158; Correspondence; New York Office; Spanish Refugee Aid Records; NYUL.

<sup>94</sup> “Modern Royalty: The Allure Endures,” *Time* May 3, 1976.

<sup>95</sup> James M. Markham, “A Royal Defender of Democracy,” *New York Times* April 12, 1981.

sophistication and historical tradition” within the United States.<sup>96</sup> Spanish intellectuals and conservatives saw the United States as the antithesis of “the true Spain,” and U.S. interventions in Latin America, frequently referred to as “imperialismo yanqui,” led to questions of U.S. democracy and threats to Hispanic culture.<sup>97</sup> By the 1920s and 1930s, the Spanish government attempted to move on from the Spanish-American War. Progressives, especially scientists and engineers, viewed the United States favorably, but conservatives perceived them negatively due to the war. Following the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, Roosevelt’s decision to remain neutral led to strengthening anti-Americanism. Roosevelt’s acceptance of appeasement “caused a great deal of unease among those progressive Spaniards who had previously been sympathetic towards the United States;” and conservatives, namely the Church, the Army, and the Falange, continued their adverse views of the United States.<sup>98</sup>

During the negotiating period for the 1970 Agreement, the United States became keenly aware of criticism from the Spanish public. In a letter to Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson, Hill discussed the three focal points of criticism:

(A) Spain is assuming risks disproportionate to the benefits it is receiving from the agreement. The presence of the bases of Spanish soil could involve Spain in a war not of its own choosing. The Spanish have no security guarantee, such as NATO members have, even if they use of the bases provokes an attack. (B) The U.S. military presence in Spain restricts Spanish sovereignty and freedom in foreign policy. (C) The Spanish do not have sufficient say in the operation and use of the bases of their own soil.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Rodríguez Jiménez, 123.

<sup>97</sup> Rodríguez Jiménez, 123; Rosa Pardo Sanz, “La política norteamericana,” *Ayer* 49 (2003), 20-22; Heiberg, 5.

<sup>98</sup> Rodríguez Jiménez, 124.

<sup>99</sup> “Congressional Hearing on Spanish Base Agreement,” August 24, 1970; Spain Vol. III Aug 1970-31 Dec 1971 (1); box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

Ford's visit to Spain during the base negotiations in 1975 epitomized this Spanish disillusionment with the United States. There was speculation that the Ford administration planned the trip for two reasons: to provide "just enough attention" to appease the Spanish for base rights and to cultivate the Spaniards "who would assume responsibility when Franco was gone."<sup>100</sup> Regarding the first point, the Ford administration's stopover in Spain was to have the president participate in base negotiations and illustrate his ties to other European NATO members. In most of his recorded conversations in Madrid, Ford spoke often of his recent visit to the Council of NATO in Brussels and his consideration of Spain in his speech there.<sup>101</sup> In his memoir, Ford recalled the speech and emphasized how Spain "could make an important contribution to our mutual security. We had to consider ways to integrate her forces with others in the West."<sup>102</sup>

Ford emphasized the significance of U.S.-Spain relations on the Atlantic community in all his public statements and speeches in Madrid. However, the Spanish people greeted the president with a lukewarm reception, which juxtaposed the celebrations for Eisenhower and Nixon during their visits. There were large crowds everywhere Ford visited, but enthusiasm for the American president was indifferent in Madrid. One of the possible reasons is the negative association Spaniards made between the United States and Franco. A question and response prepared by National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft for White House Press Secretary Ron Nessen dealt with

---

<sup>100</sup> Rubottom and Murphy, 113-4.

<sup>101</sup> In that speech, Ford only references Spain twice, but does illustrate their importance to Western defense. See Document 289 "Text of an Address Before the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Brussels" in *Public Papers of the President: Gerald R. Ford, 1975* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1977), 737-741.

<sup>102</sup> Gerald R. Ford, *A Time to Heal: The Autobiography of Gerald R. Ford* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 288.

Spanish reactions to Ford's visit as U.S. approval of a right-wing dictator, and to deflect to the importance of Spain to the Atlantic community.<sup>103</sup> Over a week after the visit, White House Chief of Staff Donald Rumsfeld wrote a letter to Ford explaining why the crowds in Madrid were apathetic during his visit. Rumsfeld explains,

I asked my friend why the large crowds that were out to see President Ford ride by were so quite, seemingly apathetic. He answered that for weeks the government, through the government press, had been making it seem that the prime purpose of President Ford's visit to Europe was to secure a new connection for Spain with NATO. ... The Spanish newspapers had headlines the day of the President's arrival to the effect that the failure of Ford to obtain Spanish membership in NATO proved that "the United States is no longer the leader of NATO." The crowds that had been brought out for the motorcade were obviously government employees and pro-Franco people. Since they had been told that President Ford had failed in the primary purpose of his visit, they did not know whether to cheer or not. They knew they had to turn out, but they didn't know whether the government wanted them to show enthusiasm.<sup>104</sup>

This illustrates that even pro-Franco factions had trouble reconciling with the visit of Ford to Madrid and the importance of the United States.

The Spanish public had hopes that the Carter administration would be a change from the previous Republican administrations. As the transition occurred and their parties were legalized, the leftist coalition of Spain hoped Carter might "put more pressure on Madrid for internal reforms."<sup>105</sup> Yet, the administration continued the U.S. approach of the previous years by stressing the importance of Spain entering the West. Throughout the time Carter occupied the White House, the Spanish interest in entering international organizations was nowhere near the American concern. Domestic issues occupied Spain, especially the economic collapse of the late 1970s. According to an ICA briefing paper,

---

<sup>103</sup> Helmut Sonnenfeldt to Scowcroft, May 1, 1975, folder: May-June 1975 – European Trip (1) WH, box 69, Ford Trips File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>104</sup> Donald Rumsfeld to Ford, June 11, 1975, folder: CO 139 – Spain 8/9/74-6/30/75, box 46, CO 139, Subject File, White House Central Files, GRFL.

<sup>105</sup> "U.S. Election: The Views Abroad," *New York Times* July 25, 1976.

66 percent of Spaniards believed 1980 would be a disaster economically and were “particularly gloomy” in their outlook for the future.<sup>106</sup> The economic situation caused considerable problems for the Suárez government. In 1980, Spaniards’ “growing disenchantment” with the government led the public to give “higher marks to the Franco regime than the present government in raising the standard of living.”<sup>107</sup> The bleak outlook appeared to be spreading beyond just fears of economic depressions. Spanish integration into the EC presented an enigma for the Carter administration. In an April 1980 survey, the Spanish public backed Spain’s efforts to join the EC by a twelve-to-one margin, but the survey also revealed that many were indifferent to Spain associating with Europe.<sup>108</sup>

Disinterest in joining the West can be traced to the Spanish perceptions of the Cold War that drew little distinction between the United States and the Soviet Union. They argued that the United States often intervened in foreign affairs of other countries and sought world domination despite helping promote human rights in developing nations. This is most evident in the reaction to Reagan’s hard power with Spain. During his May 1985 visit to Madrid, Reagan was greeted with over 500,000 protestors. While there he was greeted with demonstrations against his Nicaragua policy and his support for Spain entering NATO. Spaniards connected NATO and the West with the Cold War and wanted their country to remain neutral in the Cold War conflict. These protests provide the culmination of the Spanish views of the United States during the transition to democracy. They believed the Americans were only interested in Spain to further their

---

<sup>106</sup> “Visit of King Juan Carlos of Spain,” February 13, 1980; B-1-80; box 1; Briefing Papers, 1979-1999, Office of Research and Media Reaction; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.



own needs from the Cold War to economics. The public argued that the United States kept Franco in power for longer because he helped further American national security interests with the military bases. Once Franco died and the transition began, the Spanish public vocally protested American interference in Spain.

### 23-F

The attempted coup d'état—commonly referred to as 23-F—occurred in Spain on February 23, 1981. The military held the government hostage and dealt a major complication to both Spanish politics and U.S.-Spain relations. The Spanish military had not approved of their minimized role in the transition. Some members of the military saw the weak economy, violence of ETA, decrease in Suárez's popularity, and fracturing of the UCD as their opportunity to take control. On the night of February 23, the Cortes held a vote to confirm Calvo-Sotelo as the successor to Suárez. The coup began when Colonel Antonio Tejero led Guardia Civil into the meeting and held Parliament members hostage. At the same time, General Jaime Milans del Bosch attempted to overthrow the regional government in Valencia. Divisional General Alfonso Armada went to the royal palace to negotiate with Juan Carlos but was turned away. Armada went to the Cortes and declared that Juan Carlos had ordered him to become the military authority of Spain.<sup>109</sup>

The attempted coup failed because of the role of political actors, lack of communication among the military, and Juan Carlos's resolute televised speech. The political leaders—Suárez, González, Alfonso Guerra González (the second in command of the PSOE), and Santiago Carrillo (leader of the PCE)—reacted to the coup in unified fashion. Together they worked to keep the government together even after the Guardia

---

<sup>109</sup> Felipe Agüero, *Soldiers, Civilians, and Democracy: Post-Franco Spain in Comparative Perspective* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 11-13; Tussell, 309.

Civil removed them from the chamber. The disorganization of the military conspirators was their undoing due to a lack of communication and organization between those who participated in the coup. In addition, not all within the military supported Tejero or Milans del Bosch. The pivotal blow to the coup came from Juan Carlos when he went on television at 1:15 a.m. on February 24. In this speech, the King refused to abdicate, vowed to uphold the Constitution, and swore that the democratic process would continue for the Spanish people. After eighteen hours, Tejero and Milans del Bosch surrendered. The Cortes held a vote the next day to approve Calvo-Sotelo, and González offered to form a coalition government. The coup tested the new Spanish democracy and it survived.<sup>110</sup>

The international response to 23-F illustrates the growing distance between Spain and the United States. Once the events in Madrid made international news, Europeans reached out to show their support for the young democracy. Historian Julio Crespo MacLennan argues, the threat of a return to authoritarianism in Spain made “political cooperation with Spain . . . more important than ever” to Europeans.<sup>111</sup> While Europeans saw this as an opportunity to unite with Spain, the Reagan administration—especially Secretary of State Haig—believed 23-F was not a problem for the United States to solve. In a remark shortly after the seizure of the Parliament, Haig commented that this was “an internal matter” for the Spanish, echoing Nixon’s response to the Burgos trial—a human rights event in the Franco era.<sup>112</sup> Todman defended Haig by disclosing that reporters approached the Secretary for comment after a meeting, and Haig had not been briefed on

---

<sup>110</sup> Christopher Hill, *The Role of Elites in the Spanish Transition to Democracy (1975-1981): Motors of Change* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007), 187; Preston, *Triumph of Democracy*, 201; Charles Powell, *Juan Carlos of Spain: Self-Made Monarch* (Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1996), 173-5.

<sup>111</sup> Crespo MacLennan, 166.

<sup>112</sup> “Comment by Haig Draws Fire in Spain,” *New York Times*, March 12, 1981.

the situation. Though he had given Juan Carlos numerous assurances of U.S. support of Spanish democracy, Todman said “that one little comment, caught at the wrong moment, created some doubts.”<sup>113</sup>

Haig’s response squandered an opportunity for the United States to rehabilitate the U.S. image in Spain. The United States had military present in Madrid during the coup, and they could have easily gotten involved if given approval. As Foreign Service Officer Robert E. Barbour explained, the U.S. embassy faced criticism because of the hypocrisy of Haig and the Reagan administration as well as enraged Spaniards who took the comment at face value. Barbour highlighted that Spaniards had been criticizing the United States “for having said so much about other [internal] situations in other countries.”<sup>114</sup> If the United States was willing to interfere in other country’s business then why are they choosing to stay out of Spain? The U.S. response to the 23-F coup is an example of why the Spanish did not trust the United States and their bases.

The administration quickly worked to show Spain that they sincerely cared about the transition to democracy. Reagan authored a letter Juan Carlos on February 27 to reiterate the importance of Spanish democracy. He wrote, “You and your people are not alone as you reassert the principles of democracy which distinguish today’s Spanish example.”<sup>115</sup> There was a meeting held between Haig, Juan Carlos, and Calvo-Sotelo in April 1981, and there was talk of preparing a visit of Juan Carlos to the United States.<sup>116</sup> The reason for the quick meeting between Haig and the Spanish government dealt with

---

<sup>113</sup> Interview with Todman.

<sup>114</sup> Interview with Robert Barbour, November 30, 1992, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>115</sup> Ronald Reagan to Juan Carlos, February 27, 1981; 018865; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

<sup>116</sup> Heiberg, 105.

the ongoing negotiations of the Spanish bases and the preservation of American standing in Spain. Although the administration attempted a soft power approach, Haig's comments had damaged U.S.-Spain relations.

To build goodwill, the Reagan administration provided Spain assistance in combatting domestic terrorism. In May 1981, ETA attempted an assassination on General Valenzuela, a member of Juan Carlos's personal staff. Reagan wrote that the United States stood firm "against those who would oppose democratic government."<sup>117</sup> The attack on Valenzuela came three days after another general was killed. The Spanish government believed the Soviet Union funded ETA to serve their objective to undercut NATO discussions.<sup>118</sup> Yet, some within Spain believed that France was aiding terrorism in Spain. Fraga claimed that France was protecting the headquarters and agents of ETA because the French did "not want Spain as a political or economic competitor."<sup>119</sup> In addition, Fraga stressed in a meeting with the Ambassador Enders that Spain did not have years to fight terrorism, because it would descend into chaos within months. This scared the Reagan administration into investigating how to help Spain with counter-terrorism. The United States sent Robert Oakley to Spain to discuss a number of proposals for counterterrorism, such as: "a high-level Spanish delegation visit to the United States to work out the scope and details of cooperation, joint training, including through the Anti-

---

<sup>117</sup> Reagan to Juan Carlos, May 8, 1981; Spain: King Juan Carlos I – Cables; box 31; White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; Executive Secretariat, NSC: Head of State File; RRL.

<sup>118</sup> "Spanish Contend Soviets Back Basque Guerrillas," *The Washington Post*, May 13, 1981.

<sup>119</sup> "Meeting with Opposition Leader Fraga December 19," December 20, 1983; Spain - 1983 (December 1983) (1); RAC box 5; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

Terrorism Assistance Program, [and] cooperation with the CIA, Defense, Justice, and State.”<sup>120</sup>

The fascist gunslingers of the United States abandoned their paternalism of Spaniards. The hard power of American leadership, anti-Americanism, and the response to 23-F had drastic effects on U.S.-Spain relations and smart power. As seen through the negative reactions by the Spanish public, the U.S. hard power utilized by Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan almost derailed U.S.-Spain relations. These administrations illustrate that the United States believed they could control all aspects of the bilateral relationship with Spain. Nixon knew that Franco’s friendlessness on the world’s stage would benefit the United States in securing U.S. rights to the Spanish military bases. Further, Nixon and Kissinger believed that Juan Carlos could be the next leader of Spain with the possibility of being Franco-esque in his deference to the United States. But once the transition to democracy began, Ford and Kissinger had to change. They realized that they must support Juan Carlos or face the possibility of losing the bases. Carter attempted to change the course of U.S.-Spain relations by courting the PSOE, but Reagan arrived on the scene and undid the progress made by Carter.

The public perception of the United States and Spain during the transition to democracy shows that the U.S. and Spanish public were not enthusiastic about U.S. hard power. Congress and the media questioned whether the United States should be working with a figure like Franco. However, as the transition began, the U.S. public change its mind on Spain as Juan Carlos and pushed for establishing a constitutional monarchy. For the Spanish public, the transition to democracy highlighted the disappointment with

---

<sup>120</sup> Oliver North to John Poindexter, February 19, 1986; Spain-1986 (6); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

American leadership. This discontent continued after the United States failed to defend the nascent democracy in Spain during the attempted 23-F coup. Increasing Anti-Americanism led to hardening opposition toward the base negotiations, Spanish entry into NATO, and membership in the European Community. Despite long-standing American declarations about valuing an alliance, Spaniards realized that the United States only wanted what was best in its defensive interests—Naval Station Rota (Cadíz), Torrejón Air Base (Madrid), Morón de la Frontera (Sevilla), and Zaragoza Air Base.

## CHAPTER 2

### Quid Pro Quo: The Spanish Military Bases, NATO, European Community, and U.S. Hard Power

On September 22, 1975, Secretary of State Kissinger met with members of the American negotiating team after a conference with their Spanish counterparts. The subject of the meeting was the renegotiations for American control of Spanish military bases in Rota, Seville, Madrid, and Zaragoza. Pedro Cortina y Mauri, the Spanish Foreign Minister and leader of the Spanish negotiating team, threatened to terminate the American use of the bases if the Ford administration did not strengthen Spanish ties to NATO, a promise that Spain coveted since the 1950s. Cortina threatened the U.S. negotiators with a suspension of American use of the Zaragoza and Torrejón bases for three months “to show NATO that Spain meant business.”<sup>1</sup> The U.S. negotiating team attributed Cortina’s obsession over the NATO decision to his erroneous conviction that it was vital to Spain’s survival. U.S. Ambassador to Spain Wells Stabler explained to

---

<sup>1</sup> Wells Stabler to Kissinger, July 22, 1975, folder: Spain – State Department Telegrams To SECSTATE – EXDIS (1), box 12, Country File, National Security Adviser: Presidential Country Files for Europe and Canada, 1974-77; GRFL.

Kissinger that Cortina was “persuaded that they must get either an arrangement with NATO as a bilateral security guarantee.” Kissinger bellowed, “He’s nuts!”<sup>2</sup>

This exchange epitomizes how the United States took advantage of their hard power. Spain believed that part of their quid pro quo with the United States meant that it would be accepted into Western organizations such as NATO and the EC. However, Washington was aware of this desire and used it as leverage to maintain hard power over Madrid. This is best seen in how the United States approached negotiations to maintain control of the military bases. For American leadership, the bases were important because they gave the United States quick strike capabilities in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. The agreements and one treaty<sup>3</sup> established a quid pro quo between Madrid and Washington. Spain received economic and military aid while the United States obtained base rights. Further, Spain now had a friend on the world’s stage and hoped to use this rapport to enter the West. Yet, the presidential administrations that participated in negotiations for the bases were aware of Spain’s global predicament and took advantage to benefit the United States.

The Western organizations that Spain desired to enter were NATO and the EC. They viewed the United States as “leaders” of NATO and hoped to join for defensive benefits. American leaders consistently used NATO as hard power leverage over Spain during negotiations. They did this despite knowing that members of the Atlantic Alliance did not want another dictator to join. The same can be said for the EC, which Spain hoped would provide economic assistance and Europeanization. However, the United

---

<sup>2</sup> *FRUS*, vol. E-15 part 2, Doc. 205.

<sup>3</sup> These include the 1970 Agreement of Friendship and Cooperation, the 1974 Joint Declaration of Principles, the 1982 Executive Agreement, the 1986 Agreement, and the 1976 Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation.



States did not want Spain to join the EC because it would jeopardize their hold over Spain and ability to use Spain as an intermediary with other world regions such as the Middle East and Latin America. However, all of this changed as the transition to democracy took place. As a democratic Spain won global attention, U.S. power over Spain diminished. Further, the quid pro quo no longer became necessary as the Spanish public voted to join the EC and NATO.

### **The Spanish Military Bases**

The Cold War drove the United States into a hard power stance with Spain and the insistence on control of the military bases. In 1953, the United States and Spain signed the Pact of Madrid in which Spain received U.S. economic and military aid in exchange for granting air and naval bases occupied by the United States. These installations included the Rota, Morón, Torrejón, and Zaragoza. Each presidential administration knew of the strategic importance of the stations in Spain for proximity to the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Both regions were points of concern due to global uneasiness from international oil crises, similar transitions from dictatorships in Portugal and Greece, and popularly elected communist parties in Italy and France. In addition, the proximity of the Soviet Union to the region and the possibility of communism spreading beyond the Iron Curtain made the Spanish bases a priority for the United States. Even during the period of détente in the 1970s, the United States believed it needed to control military bases in Europe for a close strike against the Soviet Union or Soviet proxies.

The Yom Kippur War in 1973 was an example of the United States intending to use the Spanish bases in the Middle East during a conflict. The clash between Israel

against Egypt and Syria caused a volatile eastern Mediterranean. This conflict worried the United States and the Spanish bases provided a defensive post in case of an emergency strike.<sup>4</sup> The administration considered using the Spanish bases to support Israel during the Yom Kippur War, but they were met by a surprising opponent—Franco. In a letter to Nixon, Franco discussed his opposition to the operation of the bases during the conflict and urged peace, but requested that Washington not hold this against Spain:

Thus it is mandatory, in these movements of great danger in which we are living, not to curtail efforts to achieve negotiated bases of an agreement that could be accepted without placing any of the disputants in desperate peril. Otherwise, leavening of a terrorism both permanent and without quarter would create a situation of latent war that would perpetuate itself without achieving solutions to the grave tensions existing between Israel and the Arab states. For this reason I wish to communicate to you, Mr. President, that Spain stands ready to consider, with the utmost celerity, the most effective method of using her good offices in favor of a quick cease fire in the hostilities and a just and negotiated peace, in accordance with our constant policy favoring understanding between countries, and also in accordance with our firm position, put to the test during the two World Wars, that did not succeed in breaking our firm resolution to maintain the peace.<sup>5</sup>

Foreign Minister Laureano López Rodó stated that the conflict in the Middle East caused great preoccupation for Spain. He worried that the United States using the Spanish bases to launch strikes for Israel would imperil Spanish diplomacy with Arab nations. López Rodó asserted that “any use of these bases in the Middle East conflict, whether direct or indirect, would violate [the bases] agreement.”<sup>6</sup>

The major source of concern dealt with the United States housing two F-4 Phantom Aircrafts at the Torrejón airbase in Madrid. López Rodó asked about the sudden large number of tanker aircraft at Torrejón and why the two F-4s were “painted

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles T. Powell, “Spain’s External Relations 1969-1975” in *Democratic Spain: Reshaping External Relations in a Changing World* eds. Richard Gillespie, Fernando Rodrigo, and Jonathan Story (London: Routledge, 1995), 28.

<sup>5</sup> Francisco Franco to Richard Nixon, October 13, 1973; Middle East 1973; box 13; Records relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA

<sup>6</sup> “Use of Spanish Bases in Middle East Conflict,” October 16, 1973; Spain Vol 4 Jan 1972-June 1974 (2); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

differently from customary [United States Air Force] colors and which bear no numbers.”<sup>7</sup> U.S. Ambassador Horacio Rivero Jr. explained that the two F-4s were part of an ongoing sale with Iran, and the Iranian government asked that the aircraft be painted in desert camouflage colors.<sup>8</sup> Yet, Spain continued to seek assurance from the United States that they would not use the bases for the Yom Kippur War. This angered the Nixon administration, which dispatched Rivero to deliver a message to López Rodó regarding how the United States planned to use the bases. The message detailed that the Soviet Union launched “massive airlifts of arms to Syria, Egypt, and Iraq,” and the United States “will not remain passive in the face of this Soviet adventurism.”<sup>9</sup> The administration reprimanded Spain for “an inward looking attitude” towards the crisis in the Middle East.<sup>10</sup> López Rodó responded that Spain was not “inward looking,” and declared the Yom Kippur War was “neither an attack on nor a threat to [the] West, but a continuation of historical Jewish-Arab struggle.”<sup>11</sup> Spain requested the removal of tankers for security reasons, but Rivero said to postpone this until new base agreements. This conflict over the use of the bases led the United States to be prompt in the search for a solution on how to use the bases in the future.

The priority of preserving the military bases in Spain superseded all U.S. initiatives, which can be seen by the Carter administration’s human rights objectives and the State Department’s pushback. The Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs David Aaron explained in a memorandum to Carter that the naval base at

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> “Use of Spanish Bases in Middle East Conflict,” October 17, 1973; Spain Vol 4 Jan 1972-June 1974 (2); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>9</sup> “Use of Spanish Bases in Middle East Conflict,” October 19, 1973; Spain Vol 4 Jan 1972-June 1974 (2); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> “Special Joint committee Meeting: U.S. Use of Spanish Bases,” October 20, 1973; Spain Vol 4 Jan 1972-June 1974 (2); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

Rota and the Bardenas Reales aerial gunnery range “are virtually irreplaceable.”<sup>12</sup> The State Department clarified to the president that any new foreign policy goals in Spain were to fall below the bases. One document from the administration discussed achieving human rights objectives abroad, but the State Department made it clear that human rights promotion in friendly countries would not detract from national security interests. They resolved that the concern of human rights in Spain may produce “a threat to maintenance of U.S. military bases.”<sup>13</sup> In another briefing paper, the Carter administration developed three principal interests in Spain: democracy promotion, supporting European integration, and “preserving a favorable atmosphere for our security interests in Spain, particularly for our use of Spanish bases.”<sup>14</sup> This illustrates that the retention of Spanish bases for national security purposes was of the utmost importance to the United States whether this meant using the bases in a conflict or curbing administration goals.

The United States lease of the Spanish bases came from agreements signed every five years. Both the negotiations for and the nature of the arrangement was the carrot and the stick. The stick was securing the best deal possible for the United States *not* Spain, but the carrot came from funding for exchanges. For example, the 1970 Agreement included financing educational, cultural, and scientific cooperation. The United States and Spain agreed to exchange teachers, scientists, and students as well as endorse the Fulbright Program. Further, the United States “agreed to aid Spain in research, development, and advanced training of professors, particularly in the sciences.” The

---

<sup>12</sup> David Aaron to Jimmy Carter, November 2, 1979; Weekly Reports to the President 102-120, 7/79-12/79; box 42; Zbigniew Brzezinski Collection; JCL.

<sup>13</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977–1980, Volume II, Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs* eds., Kristin Ahlberg Adam M. Howard (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2013), Doc. 54.

<sup>14</sup> Briefing Paper, “U.S.-Spanish Relations,” August 1979; Spain, 9/79-1/80; box 72; Country Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

American Bicentennial received some of these funds including 120 students visiting U.S. universities and various other projects. In addition, both the United States and Spain agreed to “attach special interest to civil uses of atomic energy, the exploitation and use of space, marine sciences, medical and biological sciences, industrial technology, electronics and social sciences.” The exchange of radio and television programs, “to mutually assist their respective information media,” was an important aspect of the 1970 Agreement. Other areas discussed in the 1970 Agreement included environmental and urban development, agricultural issues, and economic help.<sup>15</sup>

These aspects carried over to the renewed agreements and treaty between the United States and Spain. The quid pro quo of the agreements was smart power—the hard power of holding defensive interests and the soft power of cultural diplomacy. Yet, the negotiations for these agreements focused almost entirely on defensive aspects and hard power. The core of the agreements dealt with money used for funding of the bases. In addition, the tactics of the U.S. negotiators were often hardline on this topic. Three of the four presidents actively participated in negotiations with Spain for the military bases. Nixon, Ford and Reagan made sure that American interests were met first. The reason American leaders knew they could take advantage of the negotiations was because Spain remained ostracized on the world’s stage. Though they made other agreements, Spain remained on the outskirts of NATO and the EC, which meant the relationship with the United States was pivotal for Spain on the global stage. This exploitation by the United States is best seen by Nixon and the negotiations of the 1970 Agreement.

---

<sup>15</sup> Summary of 1970 Agreement, 1974, folder: NSDM 268 – Renegotiations of Bases Agreement with Spain (2), box 54, Institutional Files – NSDMs, U.S. National Security Council, GRFL.

Spain presented a “shopping list” of over \$1 billion as the Nixon administration entered the White House. The United States chose from six options that were significantly smaller than the number Spain requested. Both the State and Defense Departments recommended “a top negotiating ceiling of \$175 million in grants over a five year period, and if the Spanish request, up to \$100 million in Ex-Im Bank credit or guarantees for military purchases, plus the possibility of post-Vietnam excess material (at no cost to US).”<sup>16</sup> Negotiations continued between the two sides with continued de-escalation of the monetary amount. Under Secretary of State Elliot Richardson disclosed the limited options for the United States in negotiations. He detailed that the United States wanted “a base rental for which we are willing to pay \$175 million over five years. The Spanish want a security commitment and they wanted to be treated as a formal ally and not as a leaser of real estate. The fundamental difference in approach makes a satisfactory solution difficult.”<sup>17</sup> Spain responded with an eighteen-month offer of \$52.5 million in grant aid and \$30 million in credits, but the United States countered with a two-year renewal at \$50 million in grants and \$35 million in credits.<sup>18</sup> Spain accepted the counter offer but there continued to be debates over the title of the offer.

Questions later arose over how to sign the agreement and whether it would be an agreement or a treaty. Secretary of State Rogers officially visited Europe with a stop in Spain from May 28-29, 1970. Initially talks discussed having a grand signing ceremony with Rogers present, but there were concerns over the finished technical language of the agreement. Spanish Ambassador to the U.S. Jaime Arguelles suggested Rogers “could

---

<sup>16</sup> Elliot Richardson to Nixon, March 15, 1969; US-Spanish Base Negotiations thru June 1969; box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>17</sup> *FRUS, 1969-1976, Volume XLI*, Doc. 281.

<sup>18</sup> *FRUS, 1969-1976, Volume XLI*, Doc 283; Powell, “The United States and Spain: From Franco to Juan Carlos,” 229; Liedtke, “Spain and the United States, 1945-1975,” 241.

initial the agreement rather than have a formal signing in Madrid.”<sup>19</sup> The Nixon administration scrapped the idea when it was discovered that to have a signing ceremony, they would have to submit the entire package “including the new language of the agreement and the quid pro quo to the foreign relations committee.”<sup>20</sup> By June, Spain began to inquire whether the agreement could be submitted as a treaty. Rogers explained to Foreign Minister López-Bravo and Arguelles the complexity of the Spanish case was that the “proposed agreements are so comprehensive and complex and of such a long-term nature, that under these conditions the Senate may well consider the agreements so important that they will have to take the form of [a] treaty.”<sup>21</sup> Arguelles argued that Spain would prefer a treaty over an agreement to provide the Spanish people with a security agreement, which the Spanish press pointed to as a cause of concern. Yet, Rogers and the administration did not want a treaty for fear of the optics and Congressional interference.

The possibility of a treaty faced U.S. domestic pressures as well as from Congress. The pressure on Congress due to Vietnam fatigue forced the Nixon administration to approach the negotiations with a resolute tactic. There were some members of the administration who believed the previous events might provide a better negotiating position for the United States. Former Ambassador to Spain Robert Wagner wrote to Nixon that he believed the U.S. press coverage and the Symington subcommittee forced Spain into a corner. Wagner exhibited that the “manner in which the Spanish have accepted and adjusted themselves” to the recent coverage “is a clear indication, I believe,

---

<sup>19</sup> “U.S. Spanish Base Negotiations,” May 5, 1970; Spain Vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>20</sup> “U.S. Spanish Base Negotiations,” May 13, 1970; Spain Vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>21</sup> “Conversation between Secretary of State and Minister of Foreign Affairs,” June 1, 1970; Spain Vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

that the Spanish government has decided to extend the defense agreement, come virtually what may.”<sup>22</sup> The Spanish leadership believed adverse domestic and international repercussions were in store if an agreement could not be reached. Knowing that they could take advantage of Spain, the Nixon administration now had to discover a way to get the agreement by Congress.

Armed with the understanding that negotiations must be completed in 1970, the administration began exploring how to get the budget of the agreement through Congress. There was immediate cause for concern over Section 620(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This section stated that military grant assistance cannot be given “to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth.”<sup>23</sup> Spain fell under this provision, but the administration discovered a loophole. According to Section 614(a) of the same act, the president may waive restrictions of the act, including 620(m), “when the President determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States.”<sup>24</sup> Therefore, Nixon made the argument that the bases are vital to U.S. national security, and could bypass this hindrance.

During the negotiations for the 1970 Agreement, the Nixon administration relied on the stick more than the carrot by lowering the budget, dismissing the calls for a treaty, and bypassing Congressional approval. The Franco regime entered the negotiations with a high number to continue building up Spanish defensive and economic capabilities. Yet, the United States decided to lowball Spain in negotiations. The reason that the Nixon

---

<sup>22</sup> Robert Wagner to Nixon, March 7, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (1); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>23</sup> Elliot Richardson to Nixon, February 12, 1970; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.



administration was able to do this was because of the exile of Spain to the West. Franco and his authoritarian regime made it difficult to find respectable partners on the world's stage. Therefore, Spain would be desperate for the help, and accept whatever offer was made. Nixon continued his hard power stance of negotiations by ignoring requests to turn the agreement into a treaty. The Franco regime continued looking for ways to legitimize them to the West and believed a treaty with Washington would do this. The Nixon administration argued it would be impossible due to the U.S. Congress. Yet, in future negotiations, the United States did not dismiss the calls outright.

For the next five years, the Spanish leadership pressed the United States to upgrade the 1970 Agreement to a treaty. Despite consistently being told the U.S. Congress would not allow this to happen, Kissinger placed blame on the U.S. Congress for delaying the negotiations by floating the idea of upgrading the agreement to a treaty. He disclosed that those in the Senate who pushed for a treaty “were opposed to closer relations with Spain; Senator Fulbright frankly admitted he hoped that a treaty would be concluded so that he could kill it in the Senate.”<sup>25</sup> Further, the U.S. Congress refused to sign a treaty as long as Franco retained power over Spain. Yet, once Franco died and the transition began, there was consideration on turning a new agreement into a treaty. Juan Carlos directed Areilza and his negotiating team to quickly formulate a new agreement that would provide Spain with a backchannel to NATO. While the new agreement did not exclusively require the United States to attain NATO membership for Spain, the negotiators devised a plan to have the agreement upgraded by the Senate to become a treaty. The Spanish negotiators excitedly accepted the idea and promoted it during talks.

---

<sup>25</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, May 16, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

Kissinger did warn of possible pushback from the U.S. Congress and citizens as occurred during the Nixon administration. Kissinger told Areilza that if they proposed a treaty that “the streets will be full of people,” but Areilza responded that “as ambassador in Paris, I’ve had the streets really full of angry people, they don’t bother me.”<sup>26</sup> As Robert Barbour remembers, the Spanish Foreign Minister “was like a little terrier that had Kissinger’s leg and would not let go.”<sup>27</sup>

Ultimately, there were two reasons for upgrading the agreement to a treaty. First, the treaty gave the U.S. Congress—still recovering from backlash of the Vietnam War—assurance of Spain’s democratic transition from authoritarianism and intended integration into the West. Second, the treaty showed the United States and the world that Juan Carlos and Spanish democracy achieved something Franco did not—“a degree of commitment from the United States.”<sup>28</sup> Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations Robert J. McCloskey floated the suggestion back in June 1975, but with Franco still alive, the chances of a Democratic Senate turning the agreement into a treaty was naught. The Ford administration previously ran into problems with the Senate regarding Spain in 1974 when they stalled the appointment of Peter Flanigan for Ambassador to Spain.<sup>29</sup> In a letter to John Sparkman, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, McCloskey explained,

---

<sup>26</sup> Interview with Barbour.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Viñas, “Breaking,” 249.

<sup>29</sup> In one of the first moves of the administration, Ford nominated Peter Flanigan as Ambassador to Spain. The Democratic Senate stalled the nomination, which historian Charles Powell believes was brought on by the Watergate scandal. Ford and Kissinger believed Senator Thomas Eagleton, who Ford referred to as “that goddamned Eagleton” and Kissinger referred to as a “crazy bastard,” orchestrated the stalemate. Memorandum of Conversation, Ford and Kissinger, 18 October 1974, folder: October 18, 1974 – Ford, Kissinger, box 6, National Security Adviser: Memoranda of Conversations. For a further discussion on the drama of Flanigan’s nomination, see Powell, *El Amigo Americano*, 188-91.

While there is no constitutional requirement to submit base agreements for Congressional approval, and the traditional United States practice has been to conclude such arrangements by executive agreement without such formal approval, the Administration believes that it is desirable to have fuller participation of the Legislative Branch in the conclusion of the new Spanish agreement, which is broader in scope than a purely base agreement. Such participation would provide a sound political basis for strengthening U.S. relations with Spain at an important juncture in that country's history and for the multi-year program of military and non-military assistance which is contemplated by the agreement.<sup>30</sup>

Kissinger and Areilza signed The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the United States and Spain in Madrid on January 24, 1976, and Washington confirmed the treaty later that year. In signing the treaty, the United States had placed the defensive relationship with Spain on the world's stage and combined plans for the Atlantic Alliance and the U.S.-Spanish Council, which was "a bond of great significance."<sup>31</sup>

The death of Franco and the beginning of the transition to democracy did not provide Ford and Kissinger with the same negotiating high ground that Nixon had for a few reasons. First, they could no longer count on Spain being friendless on the world stage. Many Western defensive pacts often spurned Spain because of the Franco dictatorship and refused full entrance until the restoration of democracy. Now, with the transition underway, Ford and Kissinger could not treat negotiations as a one-way street because Spain could begin looking for new alliances. Second, the global perception of the United States would suffer if it did not modify the hard power approach it used with Franco. Refusal to offer a legitimate treaty with Juan Carlos and Spain's burgeoning democracy would redound negatively on the United. Therefore, Ford and Kissinger utilized more of a carrot than a stick by issuing a treaty to Spain.

---

<sup>30</sup> McCloskey to John Sparkman, undated, folder: CO 139 7/1/75-3/31/76, box 46, CO 139, Subject File, White House Central Files, GRFL.

<sup>31</sup> Garcia Cantalapiedra, "Spanish Foreign Policy," 87.

The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation gave the United States and Spain five years to remain in a holding pattern with the military bases. However, when it came time to renegotiate the treaty, both countries had new leaders who wanted to make a stance on the bilateral relationship. Reagan planned to return U.S.-Spain relations to the hard power of the Nixon years, and Calvo-Sotelo came to be Prime Minister during a turbulent moment of the transition and pushed the U.S.-Spain relationship for approval of the Spanish public. The treaty expired on September 21, 1981, and the two sides signed an agreement to extend U.S. rights, duties, and obligations until May 1982. The United States downgraded the treaty to an executive agreement because of the perceived inevitability of Spain joining NATO. The Reagan administration believed Spain will have ascended to NATO status by that time, and “preserve in force on an interim basis United States rights regarding access to and use of important military facilities in Spain.”<sup>32</sup> The Senate consented to ratification in November 1981, Reagan approved it in December, and the respective sides met in May 1982 to discuss the constitutional requirements of the agreement. The agreement went into effect shortly afterwards and was signed in Madrid on July 2, 1982.

The Reagan administration went into the 1982 Agreement with five major concerns: transit rights, logistic naval support, nuclear-powered warships, tactical air training, and tanker support.<sup>33</sup> The United States kept the bases and access to them, and Spain received \$400 million in military sales, mostly from F-18s.<sup>34</sup> Though swiftly constructed, the agreement negotiations in the early 1980s were intricate. The major

---

<sup>32</sup> L. Paul Bremer to Richard Allen, December 2, 1981; 046000-089999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

<sup>33</sup> Heiberg, 101.

<sup>34</sup> Rubottom and Murphy, 143-4.

complications of these negotiations dealt with the U.S. Department of Defense and mistrust from the transitions. Ambassador Todman illustrated the negotiations were difficult because the Defense Department “did not appreciate that the world had changed.”<sup>35</sup> He clarified that Washington could not accept that the Franco period was over, and they could no longer dictate the overall terms to be accepted. Foreign Service member Jack R. Binns elaborates that the Defense Department’s position was to get everything possible plus a little extra. While this was not the best way to approach negotiations, the incoming Reagan administration was “a highly charged, ideological administration” not looking to lose credibility.<sup>36</sup>

On December 10, 1985, the United States and Spain issued a joint statement on the upcoming base negotiations. The statement specified it would maintain current missions and reduce the amount of U.S. forces over time with Spanish forces. In April 1986, the Reagan administration began preparations for renegotiations with Spain over base rights. In an overview, Ambassador Enders discussed where Spain and the United States stood on base rights, and what the goals of both countries were for the new agreement. Enders detailed that Spain wanted to reduce U.S. military presence and look towards collective security elsewhere. Therefore, the United States should find an agreement “that at least maintains current access and operating rights, while pointing Spain toward gradually expanding integration in the multilateral frame.”<sup>37</sup> Enders’ evidence was González’s ten-point national security plan that included the reductions of

---

<sup>35</sup> Interview with Todman.

<sup>36</sup> Interview with Jack R. Binns, July 25, 1990, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>37</sup> “Upcoming Base Negotiations with Spain: A Conceptual Framework,” April 4, 1986; Spain 1986 (4); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

U.S. forces on Spanish bases, which also worked as a way to convince the public to support NATO integration. As for the United States, Enders clarified that the Reagan administration should “to the greatest extent possible, relate our own presence to the defense concerns of Spain.”<sup>38</sup> Spain had not entered NATO yet and still relied on defensive support from the United States. They believed in the possibility of threats from their south, especially Morocco who they felt uneasiness towards regarding disputes over the Western Sahara. Enders supposed Reagan should hint at the possibility of Morocco launching an attack and the United States being able to assist in the threat from the South. However, in a bid to not immediately sink negotiations, Enders believed an opening gambit could be identifying reductions at Torrejón.

Following a meeting with Defense Minister Narcís Serra, Enders provided the Reagan administration with a more concrete picture of Spain’s goals for the negotiations. On specifics, Serra proposed no changes at Rota, but the other bases “would be available to the [United States] on a standby basis but no forces would be stationed [there] permanently.”<sup>39</sup> Enders warned Serra that this stance would cause trouble with the Reagan administration and be a lose-lose situation for both sides. Serra elucidated the governing principle would be the bases were available to the United States “in time of crisis or alert, and be maintained to U.S. standards by the Spaniards for this purpose at their cost, but that no ‘U.S. forces’ would be stationed in there permanently.”<sup>40</sup> The González government sought to end the use of F-16’s stationed in Torrejón, which was located just outside of Madrid and made many Spaniards uncomfortable with the

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> “Spanish Concept for Base Negotiations,” April 19, 1986; Spain 1986 (4); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

proximity of U.S. Cold War weapons. However, equipment that moved in and out like Usafe planes training in Zaragoza or Marine units on exercise in Morón would not be considered under this and still have usual access to the bases.

The initial negotiations were pushed back to July 1986 to assure the United States that González and the PSOE would still be in control following the elections held the previous month. If Spain asked for U.S. reductions in the bases, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead explained, the U.S. representative should emphasize that the Reagan administration was “already planning to convert U.S. military positions at Torrejón ... to mostly Spanish civilian slots and considering additional adjustments at other installations.”<sup>41</sup> Whitehead cautioned the United States was not prepared to facilitate major movements or withdrawals. Further, the State Department believed the González government had not considered the potential consequences of U.S. reductions. Immediate removal from Spain could have major financial and military implications. Yet, the PSOE committed themselves in public to acquire U.S. reductions, and the State Department believed González would not “settle merely for a symbolic U.S. gesture.”<sup>42</sup>

In a ninety-minute presentation to the Cortes on July 22, González discussed his plans for his second term, and briefly acknowledged the negotiations with the United States. He stated that the negotiations were meant to achieve a reduction of “U.S. troops and installations” in Spain.<sup>43</sup> Further, González stated that bilateral relations between the two countries would undergo a shift to something of more equal footing, becoming “more

---

<sup>41</sup> “July 10 Negotiations: Delegation Instructions,” July 4, 1986; Spain 1986 (3); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>42</sup> Bureau of Intelligence and Research Analysis, July 10, 1986; Spain 1986 (3); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>43</sup> “E.C. and NATO Top Priorities in Felipe Gonzalez’ Foreign Policy Program,” July 23, 1986; Spain 1986 (3); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

similar and more homologous to the relations that the [United States] has with other European countries.”<sup>44</sup> González strengthened this claim by arguing that Spain’s future was with Europe. With EC entry and NATO membership, González contended that Spain’s “economic, social, and political institutions would have to adjust to participate more effectively in European affairs and to cope better with the substantial transformation the country will experience.”<sup>45</sup> Gonzalez took the hard power enticements that Washington utilized, and applied them to Spanish hard power. This was the first time the United States was not in the driver’s seat for the base negotiations.

Yet this did not stop the Reagan administration from administering its own hard power during negotiations. The United States, seeing the position González was in, used the NATO decision to their advantage. Thomas R. Carmichael was a member of the USIA press section of the Madrid embassy. He revealed that during negotiations, the United States “suddenly announced unilaterally shrinking [the] bases around 10%, without even giving [Spain] a chance to pressure us, nullifying the PR advantage of standing up to the U.S., making it clear that we were not to be pushed around, and underlining that base reductions were a mixed bag on economic level.”<sup>46</sup> This was the Reagan administration using their hard power to hurt Spain. They used base negotiations and Spain’s conundrum on NATO membership to regain the advantage.

Spain and the United States met for more negotiations towards the end of 1986. New Ambassador Reginald Bartholomew met with Foreign Minister Francisco Fernández Ordóñez to discuss the role of security and the bases. Bartholomew insisted

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Interview with Thomas R. Carmichael, January 25, 2010, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.



that security “is the first thing that a government owes its people,” and could not believe “the Spanish people would support reductions in the U.S. presence at the cost of a real reduction in their security.”<sup>47</sup> Ordóñez responded that the Spanish people already supported U.S. reductions. On December 1 and 2, the two sides met in Madrid for official talks on renewing the agreement. The Spanish stood firm on U.S. reductions, especially the deployment of the 401st Fighter Wing at Torrejón. Bartholomew, the chief American negotiator, presented detailed notes on “the military costs and implications,” and threatened Spanish negotiators that their country’s contribution to the bilateral relationship “in no way entitled it to require that other [NATO] allies take on the additional burden of hosting the 401st.”<sup>48</sup> Yet, the Spanish negotiators were not intimidated and warned of a stalemate. In a later discussion, Serra refused to back down on Spanish insistence that the 401st tactical wing leave Spain, much to the chagrin of Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. The reason the United States was so insistent on keeping the 401st in Spain was because it was the primary force for the Mediterranean region and back up for Italy, Turkey, and Greece. Spain used their stance on the 401st as hard power. Aware that the United States would look bad to other NATO members—particularly Greece because of other upcoming base negotiations—Spain had the upper hand and used this ploy in their negotiations.

## **NATO**

Spain’s desire for American assistance in entrance to NATO was both a carrot and a stick for the two countries. Spain’s acceptance into NATO meant they would shed

---

<sup>47</sup> “FM Orodenez on Bases,” November 8, 1986; Spain – 1986 (2); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>48</sup> Rodney McDaniel, “Secretary Schultz Daily Report,” December 2, 1986; Spain – 1986 (1); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

the defensive exile faced since World War II. The Franco regime assumed the Atlantic Alliance would procure Spain security outside of American help and prestige among other European nations. This belief continued into the transition as Juan Carlos, Suárez, and González addressed the entrance of NATO with American leaders. For the United States, this was a hard power tool they utilized throughout negotiations for the bases. The United States knew the popular opinion that Spain could not join NATO as long as Franco held power. Despite knowing this, each administration willingly used entrance into the Atlantic Alliance as a bargaining chip during base negotiations, capitalizing on the Spanish belief that NATO was integral to Westernization.

Throughout the Franco regime and the constitutional monarchy, many Spanish leaders advocated entrance into NATO. During the 1970 Agreement negotiations, Kissinger asked diplomat Nuño Aguirre de Cárcer about the Spanish insistence for membership to the Atlantic Alliance. Aguirre replied that it “would set the course of the evolution of the entire Spanish relationship to Europe. ... Without the link to NATO, all roads seemed to be barred to Spain.”<sup>49</sup> This urgency for NATO continued under Cortina and the negotiations for the 1975 Treaty. In a memorandum to Ford, Kissinger explains how the Spanish negotiating team hammered early for the “determination of Spain’s role in Western defense, directly with the United States and in a broader, multilateral context with Western Europe.”<sup>50</sup> Much like the negotiations, Cortina made outlandish cases for the United States to persuade NATO members on the strides of Spanish political

---

<sup>49</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, May 16, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>50</sup> Kissinger to Ford, January 10, 1975, folder: Spain 1975 (1) WH, box 21, Country File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL. See also Samuel D. Eaton, *The Forces of Freedom in Spain, 1974-1979: A Personal Account* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1981), 22.

evolution. For instance, he offered a resolution where the United States flew prominent NATO members to one of the Spanish bases, “have a liaison and observers of Spain in NATO and NATO observers in Spain. To recognize Spain’s role.”<sup>51</sup> Further, Cortina threatened to terminate American use of the bases if the United States did not strengthen ties with NATO. Though this was Spain attempting to use hard power for NATO by threatening use of the bases, the United States would not be outdone.

The U.S. administrations during the transition often spoke with other NATO leaders about the possibility of accepting Spain and generally received negative reactions. For example, Secretary of State Rogers met with Danish Prime Minister Hilmar Baunsgaard during the 1970 Agreement negotiations to discuss the possibility of NATO liaisons and Spain. Baunsgaard said that he understood the geostrategic importance of Spain, but he could not support another dictator in NATO because “it was bad enough that Portugal and Greece were members of the organization.”<sup>52</sup> Another meeting occurred during the negotiations for the 1975 Treaty. Kissinger found consensus among NATO members on the Spain-NATO issue as “a divisive one for the Alliance and that dramatically closer ties between Spain and NATO must await the passing of Franco and increased democratization in Spain.”<sup>53</sup> Further, some member nations recognized Spain’s military contributions only through the agreements with the United States and did not believe entrance into NATO was necessary. Despite this, American leaders misled the Spanish side during negotiations to keep Spain from seeking other assistance.

---

<sup>51</sup> *FRUS, 1973-1976, Volume E-15, Part 2*, Doc. 203.

<sup>52</sup> “NATO Links with Spain,” April 16, 1970; Spain Vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>53</sup> Kissinger to Ford, undated, folder: Spain, 1975 (2) WH, box 21, Country File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

Spain continued to stress the importance of NATO even after signing the 1970 Agreement. In late 1973, as the Agreement reached its expiration, the United States and Spain began renegotiations. Both sides traded documents for the 1974 Joint Declaration of Principles, and Spain's intention to win acceptance among the Western powers and attain entrance to NATO. However, in the drafting of this declaration, Kissinger contorted the language to evade any sort of commitment to Spain and NATO. As future Ambassador to Spain Wells Stabler mentioned during a State Department staff meeting, "this goes considerably further [than previous agreements]. But it stops I think in any event way short of a commitment."<sup>54</sup> Links to NATO reappeared during negotiations for the treaty the next year. Once again, the United States avoided placing in the treaty the exclusivity of attaining NATO membership for Spain despite this being a major point from Areilza. The United States willfully misrepresented and dodged Spain's opportunity to join the Atlantic Alliance.

Though he did not participate in base negotiations, Carter continued the previous administrations' use of NATO as a hard power inducement. Vice President Walter Mondale wrote that he intended to exhibit during his visit to Spain how the United States "will support Spain's entry into NATO when the Spanish are ready for that step."<sup>55</sup> In a handwritten note, Carter conveyed that European nations expressed support for Spain's entry to NATO after the elections confirmed that democracy and the Constitution were adopted.<sup>56</sup> However, this opinion ran into complications when the new Spanish leaders associated NATO entrance with the U.S. use of the military bases. The Suárez

---

<sup>54</sup> *FRUS, 1973-1976, Volume E-15, Part 2*, Doc. 199.

<sup>55</sup> Walter Mondale to Jimmy Carter, May 10, 1977; Vice President's Trip to Portugal, Spain, Austria, Yugoslavia, and England: [Objectives, 5/4-10/1977]; box 12; Walter Mondale Papers; JCL.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

government linked Spanish entry into NATO with “substantial U.S. favors.”<sup>57</sup> This bothered the Carter administration as the Spanish public already detested the United States, the bases, and now connected NATO with them. This jeopardized the hard power advantage the United States had over Spain. Carter retorted that the United States “will not purchase Spain’s NATO entry.”<sup>58</sup>

However, the opposition parties now had leverage in domestic politics. Opposition parties, especially the PSOE, exploited public aversion to Spanish entry to NATO. In addition, Suárez’s own party divided on admission. In a memorandum to Carter, Aaron wrote that Suárez and the UCD were “content with the current defense set up, where they feel Spain has the benefit of the best of all possible worlds, since the left wing parties support the continuation of the bases (because they are already there).”<sup>59</sup> Following the 1977 elections, the Spanish Committee of Foreign Policy met, and González and the PSOE stood against NATO membership, which caused Suárez to maintain a neutralist position.<sup>60</sup>

Entrance to NATO was the leverage the United States held over Spain during base negotiations. However, the Spanish transition to democracy began to break this hold. The Franco regime believed that the base agreements opened the door to legitimization, and acceptance to NATO would place Spain into the West. Despite knowing that other NATO members were not high on the idea, the United States continued using the prospect of NATO entrance as a hard power inducement. However, as Spain transitioned to democracy, entering NATO became attainable. The leverage

---

<sup>57</sup> David Aaron to Jimmy Carter, November 2, 1979; Weekly Reports to the President 102-120, 7/79-12/79; box 42; Zbigniew Brzezinski Collection; JCL.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Garcia Cantalapiedra, “Spanish Foreign Policy,” 87.

Washington had in promising to gain Spanish acceptance into the Atlantic Alliance would no longer work.

Domestically, the political approval of NATO entry split Spain into those who approved—Calvo-Sotelo and the UCD—and those who objected—González and the PSOE. Calvo-Sotelo accelerated the process for Spanish entry into NATO because he feared the rising popularity of the PSOE and their anti-NATO stance. The government held debates in October and November 1981. In December, Calvo-Sotelo and the Cortes voted to enter NATO, and officially join in 1982.<sup>61</sup> The United States prepared best-case and worst-case scenarios following the vote. U.S. NATO Ambassador Tap Bennett explained that the best case involved enough domestic support for an invitation to NATO. However, the worst case involved “inter-action or reluctance on the part of Spanish and other European socialists, and/or further internal disorder could destroy the possibility of a Spanish membership bid for the foreseeable future.”<sup>62</sup> In addition, if Spain failed to gain entrance to NATO, the political and psychological setbacks for Spain, NATO, and the United States could be insurmountable.

Almost all facets of the Spanish public had qualms with the Atlantic Alliance. In a poll conducted by the USIA before the vote, the majority of those informed about NATO opposed membership. Interestingly, entrance to the Atlantic Alliance divided the military. Junior military officers split 48 to 43 percent on entry, but the senior officers overwhelmingly favored entry, 88 to 12 percent.<sup>63</sup> This illustrates how those from the

---

<sup>61</sup> Jonathan Story, “Spain’s External Relations Redefined: 1975-89” in *Democratic Spain: Reshaping External Relations in a Changing World* eds. Richard Gillespie, Fernando Rodrigo and Jonathan Story (London: Routledge, 1995), 37.

<sup>62</sup> “Shaping European Attitudes: NATO in the Next Semester,” June 5, 1981; NATO-European Attitudes; 90103, box 3; Sven Kraemer files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>63</sup> “Spaniards Inclined Against NATO Entry,” March 26, 1981; B-10-81; box 1; Briefing Papers, 1979-1999; Office of Research and Media Reaction; RG 306; NARA.

Franco era still associated NATO with the United States and the West, but the “successor generation” that the United States coveted did not approve. In a national survey published by *Cambio 16*, support for NATO came from those in the upper class, and the lower middle class housed the greatest opposition.<sup>64</sup> As for party lines, the UCD supported entry, and the Basque and Catalan national parties joined the PCE in opposition to membership.<sup>65</sup> The PSOE opposed this vote, and made removal from NATO a central part of their electoral platform.

However, once in office in 1982, González did not immediately end the possibility of Spanish entrance to NATO. Instead, he flip-flopped his position and began supporting NATO membership. González considered it as necessary for the Europeanization of Spain and eventual admission to the EC. In addition, González saw NATO membership as an avenue to reduce American military presence in Spain. Binns indicated that González, “as any good politician,” believed that “by keeping Spain in NATO he would strengthen Spain’s European credentials, please his European allies and his colleagues in the EC so that they would accede to Spain’s membership and would get rid of at least part of his ‘bone in the throat’ over the bases.”<sup>66</sup> For González, NATO was the necessary evil to achieve Europeanization. In a farewell discussion with Todman, González explained that he hoped for Spanish entrance into NATO, but he knew that the process would be difficult in gaining support from the Spanish public. González planned to roll out a campaign in 1984 detailing the advantages and disadvantages of joining the Atlantic Alliance. He drew a distinction between the Atlantic Alliance and NATO

---

<sup>64</sup> “Spanish Public Tends to Oppose Membership in NATO,” July 16, 1981; N-55-81, box 3; Foreign Opinion Notes: 1973-1989; Office of Research; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> Interview with Binns.

because “the latter term signified full Spanish military integration,” which the public balked at due to the current defense pact with the United States.<sup>67</sup>

The United States supported Spain entering NATO but knew of the unpopularity among the Spanish public. In a speech at the Institute of International Questions in Madrid, Weinberger mentioned the Cortes vote to enter NATO. He illustrated “this is Spain’s decision to make and we will respect your conclusion.”<sup>68</sup> However, Weinberger stressed Spain should share the benefits and burdens of NATO membership. During a meeting with González, Secretary of State Schultz similarly stressed the importance of Spain joining NATO. The United States continued approaching NATO allies for their opinions on Spanish entry. The administration approached Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi to help convince Gonzalez on NATO membership. They even provided the Italian Embassy with talking points such as, “In our view, Felipe González is the only Spanish leader who can bring Spanish public opinion around on this issue. His course of action will depend on a careful weighing of the domestic and foreign policy costs and benefits of withdrawal vs. continued NATO membership.”<sup>69</sup> In addition, the West German Embassy wrote to the United States following a meeting of Serra with ten EC ambassadors that the opposition to NATO was born of “anti-American emotions.”<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> “Prime Minister’s Comments on NATO,” August 5, 1983; Spain - 1983 (July 1983-August 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>68</sup> Casper Weinberger, “Remarks by the Secretary of Defense before the Institute of International Questions,” March 24, 1983; Spain - 1983 (March 1983-April 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>69</sup> “Spain and NATO,” October 8, 1983; Spain - 1983 (October 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>70</sup> “Spain and NATO: DEFMIN Serra’s Meeting with EC Ambassadors,” November 16, 1983; Spain - 1983 (November 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.



González now faced questions of how to justify entrance into the Atlantic Alliance after running a campaign against NATO. One path was to hold a referendum and put the fate of Spanish entry into the hands of the public. This mortified the United States for fear that the Spanish public would support NATO, but at the cost of removing America from the bases. The Reagan administration's chief concern with the referendum was that González "avoid actions which foreclose military integration or establish a bases/NATO trade off."<sup>71</sup> Further, the administration's strategy during the buildup to the vote was to avoid pressuring Spain, but make clear their views and concerns. As calls for the referendum intensified, the United States started questioning whether this was the correct path to decide on NATO. There were multiple attempts by the United States to influence the decision and stop the vote.<sup>72</sup> After four years of debate, the referendum was set for March 12, 1986 with González campaigning for a yes vote.

Following this announcement, Spain held Parliamentary debates on the NATO referendum. González argued that membership "could advance foreign policy goals, such as membership into the [EC] and enticing France to cooperate with the Spanish government in the fight against ETA."<sup>73</sup> González counted a powerful ally in his corner regarding Spanish entry to NATO. Juan Carlos was an outspoken advocate of Spanish entry into the Western world, and the Atlantic Alliance offered a chance to do this.<sup>74</sup> Further, there was a basic assumption—one held by the Spanish king—that if Spain entered NATO, the reliance on American military presence would be reduced.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Briefing Materials for Judge Clark, October 9, 1984; Spain 10/9/84-10/12/84 (1); box 5; William P. Clark Files, RRL.

<sup>72</sup> Maxwell Rabb Telegram, October 28, 1985; Spain – 1986 (1); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>73</sup> Encarnación, 87-8.

<sup>74</sup> Powell, *Juan Carlos of Spain*, 177.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*; Tussell, *Spain*, 343.

However, the opposition proved to be an obstacle during the debates. After a February debate, González appeared shaken, and admitted the opposition in the debate had swamped his efforts “to identify a consensus on security policy with its exploitation of the theme of socialist inconsistency in switching from opposition to support NATO.”<sup>76</sup> Further, the polls appeared indecisive, which meant the electorate could side with either party.

The United States supported Spanish entry to NATO for decades, but now needed to consider the possibility of the referendum failing. A member of the National Security Council (NSC) wrote to National Security Advisor John Poindexter that the United States could not brandish either carrots or sticks, and the only course of action was to “wring our hands at the likely outcome.”<sup>77</sup> Ambassador Enders believed the critical question of a possible failure was how to persuade González from denouncing the US-Spain agreement. Enders explains:

In case of a defeat our objective should be to slow Gonzalez down and prevent a decision until we have had an opportunity to consult with him, and he has had an opportunity to explore possibilities of agreement with opposition parties on the action to take. Above all, we should attempt to avoid a situation in which the Cortes acts formally to denounce the treaty. It would be desirable but ultimately less important to avoid statements of withdrawal, or submission of draft legislation.<sup>78</sup>

However, the results of the referendum alleviated U.S. fears. The vote ended with 53 percent in favor of joining NATO, and González could now focus on Spanish entrance to the EC.

---

<sup>76</sup> “Gonzalez Worried about Referendum,” February 8, 1986; Spain – 1986 (6); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>77</sup> Donald Mahley to John Poindexter, February 18, 1986; Spain – 1986 (6); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>78</sup> “What if the Referendum Fails,” March 7, 1986; Spain – 1986 (5); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

Despite using it as a hard power inducement during previous administrations, the United States ultimately did not achieve Spanish entrance into NATO. Instead, González and the PSOE reversed course from their 1982 campaign against NATO, and called for a referendum to let the voters of Spain decide on their future in the Atlantic Alliance. González placed his political standing in jeopardy by changing his position on NATO. Yet, he and the PSOE campaigned in 1986 that if the referendum were a success it would lead to Europeanization and less reliance upon the United States. González used the United States' own hard power against them by turning NATO membership into a method to remove U.S. influence with the bases. The Spanish people spoke despite feeling betrayed by González's change of heart.

### **The European Community**

Just as they believed NATO would end their military banishment to the West, Spanish leaders believed entrance into the EC would cease their economic ostracism. The Franco regime completed a preferential trade agreement with the EC in 1970; and, as the transition occurred, democratic leaders believed economic integration with Europe became more of a priority than NATO. The United States objected to Spain cooperating with the EC, despite some American leaders believing the contrary. The major concern was that acceptance into the EC would lead to improved economic standing, disrupt national security issues, and threaten U.S. tenure over the bases. The United States had no problem with Spain working with other countries in the Middle East and Latin America but only as an American mediator. U.S. leaders felt threatened when Spain entered trade agreements with Europe. This occurred in 1970 and again in 1986 with similar outcomes—Spain signed a trade agreement with the EC and the United States threatened

hard power response by taking the agreements to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

On June 29, 1970, Spain and the EC entered into a preferential trade agreement, months before they signed the U.S. agreement. This caused tension between the Franco regime and the Nixon administration because of a complicated relationship between the United States and the EC. While they approved of European integration, the United States feared a united Europe jeopardized American military and leadership abroad.<sup>79</sup> The United States dominated industrialization in Spain in the 1960s, but, as the decade wore on, the volume of foreign investment fell by almost 20 percent. Because of this, Spain—especially the regions of Catalonia and Basque country—sought closer links to Europe than the United States.<sup>80</sup> The preferential agreement provided a decrease of trade barriers between the EC and Spain over six years, but it had a limited scope because it was only a preferential agreement to grant Spain the title of “Mediterranean country.”<sup>81</sup> Though the arrangement did not allow Spain to join the Community, it laid the groundwork for acceptance into Europe after Franco’s demise.

The State Department soon became concerned that this movement toward Europe might endanger their hold of the bases. In a letter to Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Martin Hillenbrand, George W. Landau—Country Director for Spain and Portugal in the Bureau of European Affairs of the State Department—argued the United States “should make it quite clear that this [agreement] may be extremely

---

<sup>79</sup> Jussi M. Hanhimäki, *The Rise and Fall of Détente: American Foreign Policy and the Transformation of the Cold War* (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2013), 61-2.

<sup>80</sup> Fred A. López III, “Bourgeois State and the Rise of Social Democracy in Spain” in *Transitions from Dictatorship to Democracy: Comparative Studies of Spain, Portugal, and Greece* ed. Ronald H. Chilcote (New York: Taylor & Francis, 1990), 21.

<sup>81</sup> Rubottom and Murphy, 99-100; Tussell, *Spain*, 250.

damaging to our forthcoming base negotiations.”<sup>82</sup> In a separate letter to Hillenbrand, Landau and Abraham Katz—the Director of the Office of Regional and Political Affairs in the Bureau of European Affairs—disclosed how Spain clarified in discussions that the agreement with the EC was important. Landau and Katz detailed that Spain “has made clear any U.S. attempts to interfere with her agreement with [the] EC would be resented and may cost us dearly in base negotiations and in economic reprisals.”<sup>83</sup> In addition, John Petty—Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs—described how detrimental U.S. interference could be not only to U.S.-Spain relations but also U.S.-E.C. relations. Petty revealed the United States “will be faced with a choice of a highly political confrontation with the EC involving withdrawal of concessions or watching the disintegration of the multilateral trading system.”<sup>84</sup> Despite these concerns, Nixon took their grievance with the preferential trade agreement to GATT.

Though members of the Nixon administration opposed Spain’s integration into the EC, there was a dissenting voice about U.S.-E.C. relations: Kissinger. One of the key concepts he implemented was the idea of a unified Europe as a strategic advantage for the West during the Cold War. Kissinger, from his own personal history, understood democracy as susceptible to turmoil, promoted the “nation” as the building block of order, and attempted to reinforce a hierarchy of world powers.<sup>85</sup> He explains European unity was preferable to a “cacophony of conflicting nationalities whose impotence would sooner or later cause them to abdicate a serious concern with foreign policy and thus

---

<sup>82</sup> George Landau to Martin Hillenbrand, January 13, 1970; ECIN - Economic Affairs Economic Integration Jan-May 1970; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>83</sup> George Landau and Abraham Katz to Martin Hillenbrand, January 13, 1970; ECIN - Economic Affairs Economic Integration Jan-May 1970; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>84</sup> John Petty to Martin Hillenbrand, et. al, January 13, 1970; ECIN - Economic Affairs Economic Integration Jan-May 1970; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>85</sup> Daniel J. Sargent, “The United States and Globalization in the 1970s,” in *The Shock of the Global*, 50-1; Jeremy Suri, “Henry Kissinger and the Geopolitics of Globalization,” in *The Shock of the Global*, 185.

become functional, if not actual, neutralists.”<sup>86</sup> This starkly contrasted with other administration officials who believed a unified Europe might endanger U.S. standing with Spain. Kissinger understood the geostrategic importance of Spain in providing a solid European defense. He believed it was important to continue a balanced relationship between the United States and Spain regardless of the latter’s leadership. Kissinger clarified the United States’ choice “was whether to ostracize and oppose the existing regime or, while working with it, to extend our contacts and therefore our influence for the post-Franco period.”<sup>87</sup> As the United States transitioned, American policymakers prepared for a peaceful and moderate transition to democracy in Spain.

Kissinger’s approval of Spain integrating into Europe carried over to the Carter administration under Brzezinski. The State Department and Brzezinski formulated the early foreign policy priorities and goals for the Carter administration. There was an emphasis placed on “reinvigorating the nation’s moral purpose,” and “reasserting American prestige through the restoration and promotion of liberal democratic values in an international context.”<sup>88</sup> Particularly, the State Department addressed a pressing concern that the Carter administration wished to disassociate from the previous presidencies. They demonstrated that the United States needed to augment relations with the EC especially because strong economic ties to Western Europe were essential to containing the Soviet Union. The State Department floated the idea to improve upon relations with the EC to placate Western Europe. With the establishment and growth of the EC, frictions with the United States occurred over “economic issues, failures to consult, and—particularly during the Nixon-Ford Administration—a U.S. inability to

---

<sup>86</sup> Henry Kissinger, *White House Years* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979), 427.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 931.

<sup>88</sup> Zanchetta, 9.

deal with the EEC as an entity on a basis of equality.”<sup>89</sup> The State Department denoted other issues that could improve diplomacy with the EC, which included establishing contacts with European leaders, an approach to Eurocommunism, improve NATO, and discuss issues of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.<sup>90</sup>

Though hostility towards the EC pervaded the Nixon years, the Carter administration approved of Spain moving closer towards Europe. From a prepared paper of the NSC, the enlargement of the EC to include Spain, Portugal and Greece could have both positive and immediate negative factors. Spanish acceptance into the EC could stabilize and strengthen democratic forces, but their economy was not on par with Western Europe, leading to a few future problems. Therefore, in order to keep Spain on the democratic path, the United States had “an interest in doing what [it] can to avoid a breakdown in negotiations between them and Europe and smoothing their way into Europe.”<sup>91</sup> In June 1977, following the elections, Suárez sent a delegation to bid for Spanish entry into the EC. While the major political parties divided over NATO, there was unanimity in the decision to join the Community. By November 1977, Spain became the twentieth member of the Council of Europe, though not the EC, which “meant that the international community was serious in accepting that the political and institutional transformation was already so advanced.”<sup>92</sup> A joint survey of six Western European nations by the EC and United States International Communications Agency (USICA, formerly USIA) illustrated their stance on Spanish acceptance to the EC. Over 41 percent

---

<sup>89</sup> “Western Europe Plans,” Transition: State and Defense Options Papers [2], 11/76, Western Europe; box 41; Plains File - Subject File; JCL.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume III, Foreign Economic Policy* eds. Kathleen B. Rasmussen and Adam M. Howard (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2013), Doc. 42.

<sup>92</sup> Viñas, “Breaking the Shackles,” 251.

in West Germany and 63 percent in Italy approved Spain's integration into the EC, and all nations polled believed Spain deserved admission over Portugal and Greece.<sup>93</sup> There appeared to be positive movement on the Spain-EC issue, which led the Carter administration to believe Europeanization in Spain was inevitable.

The Reagan administration had a tepid response to Spain considering EC membership for a couple of reasons. One was the concern over the economic impact on the United States, and the second dealt with diplomatic relations between Spain and Latin America. In a meeting with U.S. and British officials, the Reagan administration outlined their platform on Spain entering the EC. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Burt revealed that the United States believed "Spanish accession at the earliest possible date is important for a variety of reasons, including the impact it will have on the Spanish decision on NATO as well as its broad effect on Spanish democracy."<sup>94</sup> However, there was concern the Community kept delaying Spain—as well as Portugal—due to the economic impact of adding the two countries. France and Italy were the "major stumbling blocks" on reaching a consensus within the EC because they believed there would be a glut on olive oil and wine on the market, which would be detrimental to their own exports to the Community.<sup>95</sup> The United States supported Spain entering the EC to strengthen Western ties and democracy, but "insisted to the Ten that EC enlargement must not be at the expense of U.S. economic interests."<sup>96</sup> On December 1984, the EC came to an

---

<sup>93</sup> Briefing Paper "Visit of King Juan Carlos of Spain," February 2, 1980; Spain, King Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia, 2/15/80; box 12; VIP Visit Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>94</sup> "Demarche to British on Spanish EC Accession," June 17, 1983; Spain - 1983 (May 1983-June 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>95</sup> Briefing Materials for Judge Clark, October 9, 1984; Spain 10/9/84-10/12/84 (1); box 5; William P. Clark Files, RRL.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.



agreement on wine surpluses and the target date for Spain to join the Community was January 1986.

González campaigned to the EC that Spain would be a potential and suitable mediator between Europe and Latin America. The Falklands War and other political and social revolutions caused Europeans to take an interest in having a Latin American arbiter. González pitched Spain as a delegate for relations with Latin American countries. In a meeting between the EC and Latin American foreign ministers, Spain's foreign minister was invited to participate.<sup>97</sup> However, the United States believed Spanish entrance to the EC hindered the United States' ability to use Spain as a mediator with Latin America. For example, Robert E. Service described how the United States and Spain viewed each other as "rivals for influence" in the region.<sup>98</sup> The González government believed the United States exaggerated the communist takeover, and even the political right in Spain disagreed with U.S. policies in the region. Again, the Reagan administration objected to Spain working with the EC over policies that the United States and Spain had been working on.

The Reagan administration's response to González and Latin America explains why the United States was afraid of Spain joining the EC. The United States historically used Spain as an intermediary with the Middle East and Latin America, especially during the transition to democracy. Specifically, Nixon focused on Spain's relationship with Latin America, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East. Foreign Minister Castiella bragged to Nixon that Spain "can count on at least 40 votes on any issue in the UN thanks

---

<sup>97</sup> MacLennan, 177-8.

<sup>98</sup> Interview with Robert E. Service, February 24, 1998, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

to support of the Arab, Latin American, and most African countries.”<sup>99</sup> The Nixon administration believed Spain played a pivotal role in working in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. During a conversation early in the administration, Nixon told Castiella that Spain must be friendly with the Mediterranean countries “for the good of the rest of the world.”<sup>100</sup> Nixon reiterated this point a year later when discussing public perception of U.S.-Spain relations. Nixon said that opinions of the bilateral relationship were only about tourism and bases, but the United States did not consider Spain “to be a convenience but rather the anchor of the Western Mediterranean.”<sup>101</sup> Yet, the fear of Soviet influence in the region drove Washington to reiterate this often. Franco’s anti-communist stance provided the United States with an ally to contain the Soviet Union. Carrero Blanco argued that he was totally unconvinced that the Soviets “wanted peace in the Mediterranean,” and pointed to Yasser Arafat and George Habash being “fanatics and utterly unpredictably outbidding one another for Russian and Chinese support.”<sup>102</sup> Spain continued to be important to the U.S. into the Carter administration. During the 1980 visit, Carter and Suárez met to discuss a variety of world events such as the situations in the Middle East, Latin America, and Western defense. Carter wrote to Suárez after his return to the United States asking him that while he visited the Middle East “to pursue the idea we discussed last month of consulting personally on major foreign policy questions.

---

<sup>99</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, March 26, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, March 17, 1970; Spain Vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>102</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, October 2, 1970; President’s European Trip Sep 27-Oct 5, 1970 Memorandum of Conversations; box 467; President’s Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

... I am sure your talks in the countries you visit will be useful in obtaining a better perspective on Arab attitudes to these questions.”<sup>103</sup>

When discussing Latin America, Nixon and Franco often discussed communism in the Caribbean and South America. Franco said that popularity of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara was not as dangerous as Castroism. Essentially, the individual was not as dangerous as the message. This led López Bravo to point to Salvador Allende and the White Front in Uruguay as examples. He detailed that he was not impressed by Allende, whom he regarded as “a man without importance: a Socialist who lucked into power because of the division among his opponents.”<sup>104</sup> With this analysis, the Nixon administration believed that the Spanish would be an asset in Latin America. However, this would be tested when Gulf Oil asked Spain to help with a settlement with Bolivian Gulf Oil.

In October 1969, the Bolivian government nationalized the Bolivian Gulf Oil company, a subsidiary of Gulf Oil. The United States and Gulf Oil approached Spain and Hispanoil to assist in a quick settlement with the Bolivian government. There was a conditional agreement that Hispanoil would provide technical assistance to Bolivia in return for a fee.<sup>105</sup> Local Gulf Oil representative John P. Fitzpatrick spoke with López-Bravo on December 24, 1969 to discuss the proposal of Hispanoil’s assistance in the Bolivian problem. López-Bravo said that he only received a letter from Ambassador Hill, and this was not a satisfactory as he wanted official U.S. government request. Hill

---

<sup>103</sup> Jimmy Carter to Adolfo Suárez, February 9, 1980; Spain, King Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia 2/15/80; box 12; VIP Visit Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>104</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, April 14, 1971; Spain Vol 3 Aug 1970-31 Dec 1971 (2); box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files, RNL.

<sup>105</sup> George Philip, *Oil and Politics in Latin America: Nationalist Movements and State Companies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 111.

personally met with López-Bravo in January and he stressed that he was “unable to provide government to government support for Gulf proposal unless [the United States] makes full and direct request for [Spanish] assistance.”<sup>106</sup> Rogers wrote a note that was word for word what Hill said in his meeting with López-Bravo, who then accepted the agreement. Yet, Gulf cut out Hispanoil “when she became too greedy.”<sup>107</sup> Hill immediately went into saving face particularly because Spain was invited by Gulf, Bolivia, and the United States to participate in the settlement. Hill argued that Bolivia “must bear major onus” in this.<sup>108</sup>

Though the United States had a stake in Spain and integration into the West, the Carter administration began to see the importance of the Spanish transition to democracy and the impact it could have on Latin America. Specifically, Carter saw the Spanish transition as an example for Latin America. Spain illustrated how a nation peacefully transitioned from authoritarianism to a democracy and did not succumb to communism in doing so. For Nixon and Ford, Spain played a role in Middle East policy, but were included on Latin American policy talks. Initiatives for Carter took place in the Caribbean and Central America. In the Caribbean, the Carter administration focused on Castro and Cuba. Often Nixon and Ford dealt with Spanish-Cuban trade policies, especially concerning embargos on Cuba by the United States and the Organization of American States’ expulsion of Cuba. For Carter, there were questions of whether to raise discussions in NATO of the possibility of Western trade and credit embargo against Cuba. The risks were to upset the balance of Spanish-Cuban relations, especially since

---

<sup>106</sup> “Bolivian Gulf Oil,” January 5, 1970; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (1); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>107</sup> Philip, *Oil and Politics*, 111.

<sup>108</sup> “Gulf Oil Negotiations, September 3, 1970; Spain Vol. III Aug 1970-31 Dec 1971 (1); box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

Spain had just sunk \$221 million into Cuban trade.<sup>109</sup> This would have represented a hard power approach from Carter, but Vance disapproved of the suggestion.

When discussing Central America, the Carter administration focused on Panama. Both Carter and Panama's leader Omar Torrijos showed interest in the Spanish transition. Carter explained that he and General Torrijos debated on "if we can help King Juan Carlos of Spain with his upcoming election. [They have] not had much experience with democratic processes. We may send someone over to give him private advice on how an election should be conducted, how to use television, to get-out-the-vote processes, and so forth."<sup>110</sup> In addition, Juan Carlos showed appreciation to Carter and Torrijos about the Panama Canal Treaties. The Spanish king wrote to Carter that he wished "to express ... the satisfaction of the Spanish government and people," and detailed the ties of Spain to the American continents.<sup>111</sup> Carter responded "in view of the historic and profound ties of Spain with the New World. Your encouragement on this occasion is a major contribution to a greater understanding among the republics of the Americas."<sup>112</sup> This last statement emphasized how the United States saw the Spanish transition as an example for Latin American countries to do the same.

Much like Carter, the Reagan administration regarded the Spanish transition to democracy as an important example in promoting democracies in Latin America. Both Spain and the United States had specific interests in Latin America's subregions. In the Caribbean, Spain focused on U.S.-Cuba relations and the U.S. invasion of Grenada. Spain

---

<sup>109</sup> *Foreign Relations, 1977-1980, Volume XXIII, Mexico, Cuba, and the Caribbean* eds. Alexander O. Poster and Adam M. Howard (Washington: United States Government Publishing Office, 2016), Doc. 32.

<sup>110</sup> Carter, *White House Diary*, 85.

<sup>111</sup> Telegram from Juan Carlos to Jimmy Carter, April 29, 1978; CO 145 Executive 1/20/77-12/31/79; box CO-54; WHCF; JCL.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*

believed that U.S. policy toward Cuba should undergo an evolution. The González government used Spanish history to justify this stance. They maintained that the United States could destabilize the Castro regime by opening cultural relations with Cuba. Spain argued this worked when Franco opened to European tourism.<sup>113</sup> During his visit to the United States in 1982, González discussed the ongoing issues occurring in the region, specifically U.S. aggression. Reagan promised the United States would work towards peace in the area.<sup>114</sup> Yet, within a year of this meeting, the United States invaded Grenada much to the chagrin of the Spanish public. In a USIA survey of 1,000 Spanish adults, 57 percent disagreed with the invasion, 44 percent strongly disagree, and the “successor generation”—those 18 to 34 years old—overwhelmingly disapproved at 82 percent.<sup>115</sup> González made public statements against the invasion and hoped for a quick ceasefire in Grenada. The USIA concluded the negative opinion of Grenada was part of a larger skepticism of U.S. foreign policy. According to the survey, 72 percent believed that the Reagan administration’s policies within the last year “had done more to increase the risk of war than to promote peace.”<sup>116</sup> The reheating of the Cold War worried Spaniards about the escalation of war, not only in Europe but also in Latin America.

In Central America, the United States and Spain emphasized the importance of collaborating to reestablish democratic governments. Secretary of State George Schultz and Foreign Minister Fernando Morán López worked towards a collaborative policy in a meeting in June 1983. Schultz explained that U.S. efforts “were fundamentally aimed at bringing about democratic reforms and institutions, economic reform, and progress” in

---

<sup>113</sup> Interview with Service.

<sup>114</sup> MacLennan, 177-8.

<sup>115</sup> “Spanish Public Predominantly Rejects US Action In Grenada,” January 17, 1984; N-1-17-84; box 4; Foreign Opinion Notes: 1973-1989; Office of Research; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

Central America.<sup>117</sup> Schultz gave a specific example of Nicaragua and explained it became disruptive due to Soviet and Cuban influence, which caused military activity in the region. Further, Schultz argued that economics could not deter military activity in Nicaragua. He emphasized a need “to find a process of democratic patterns and economic development, buttressed by a security shield.”<sup>118</sup> Morán agreed and stated that Central America’s problems were “structural and they needed to find outside diplomatic help to improve the process and find a framework to alleviate the region’s stress.”<sup>119</sup> Essentially, Schultz presented the use of smart power in Central America.

In South America, Spain’s interests lay in the transition to democracy in Uruguay. Morán echoed Schultz’s suggestion of using smart power. He suggested the United States and Spain collaborate to reestablish democracy in Uruguay “through political persuasion and economic assistance (particularly through the IMF).”<sup>120</sup> Further, he believed an example was needed “to create an imitative effect in the Southern cone region,” and Uruguay could provide the example needed to develop the model.<sup>121</sup> However, the ongoing economic crisis caused major problems with Morán’s plan. He recommended that the Reagan administration, in tandem with Spain, become involved to alleviate the economic problems in Uruguay. The United States could “use its economic and political power to get IMF assistance for Uruguay and help restore middle-of-the-road democracy.”<sup>122</sup> Yet, Spain believed democracy was not too far from spreading around South America. Morán recalled Juan Carlos’s recent visit to the continent and

---

<sup>117</sup> “Secretary’s June 10 Meeting with Spanish Foreign Minister Moran,” June 18, 1983; Spain - 1983 (May 1983-June 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices; White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

commented that Brazil would soon become a democracy as well. If Uruguay and Brazil began a transition to democracy, Spain believed the entire sub region would follow suit.

Though the United States used Spain as mediators to the Middle East and Latin America, the Soviet Union believed they could use the Spanish as mediators with Eastern Europe in the early 1970s. Foreign Minister Lopez Bravo met with his Soviet counterpart in Moscow prior to the 1970 E.C. agreement. This meeting not only ended a thirty-year diplomatic estrangement caused by Russian involvement in the Spanish Civil War, but also sparked discussion about Spain opening contacts with Eastern European nations. López-Bravo used this meeting to Europeanize Spain and “promote its more active participation in the process of negotiating East-West security arrangements.”<sup>123</sup> There were concerns within the Nixon administration that if Spain integrated, they would be more willing to work with the Soviet Union. The Cold War rivalry blinded the United States as both Nixon and Reagan attempted to undermine the agreements signed by Spain and the EC.

The United States using Spain as an arbiter in Latin America was jeopardized by Spain getting close to the EC. Therefore, Nixon and Reagan approached the GATT to end the agreements. The NSC concluded the preferential trade agreement between Spain and the EC violated the GATT. The United States argued against the EC reaching limited preferential trade agreements with non-members. NSSM 46 contended the United States had “considerable bilateral economic interests in Spain, being the largest supplier of goods to Spain (\$590 million in 1968), the largest market for Spanish exports (\$279

---

<sup>123</sup> “Lopez Bravo Meeting in Moscow,” January 12, 1970; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (1); box 704; Country Files – Spain, NSC Files; RNL.



million in 1968) and having investments totaling \$500-600 million.”<sup>124</sup> Further, the Nixon administration did a preliminary examination of which American industries this would affect the most, and determined that the citrus industry would be greatly affected. In a letter to Nixon, R.J. Arbuthnot, a former president of the La Verne Fruit Exchange, stressed his anger over the 40 percent reduction of tariff on citrus fruits to Spain. He claimed “this unfair practice” would be detrimental to California and Arizona citrus producers as they exported almost \$70 million of the fruit.<sup>125</sup> In a written response, Staff Assistant to the President Noble Melencamp reassured Arbuthnot that the United States made their grievances heard by stating “that the U.S. exports of fresh oranges have been damaged by the discriminator preferences in favor of certain Mediterranean countries.”<sup>126</sup>

A few months later, the NSC produced National Security Decision Memorandum (NSDM) 45. With this document, the Nixon administration protested that the Spain-E.C. agreement was in violation of GATT. However, after the condemnation of the agreement, the United States tried to preserve relations with the two entities by saying the United States would accept a new plan that was GATT compliant. The NSDM details that Nixon “would not seek compensation in return for accepting such a legal arrangement, nor would it seek exception of particular items from the arrangement,” and decided “there was no need for any decision on a fallback position at this time.”<sup>127</sup> In a meeting between Arguelles and Nathaniel Samuels, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the administration reiterated their stance. Arguelles said the meeting was not encouraging

---

<sup>124</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume XLI*, Doc. 287.

<sup>125</sup> R.J. Arbuthnot to Nixon, February 5, 1971; GEN IT 6-3 Economic Community - Common Market (EEC) 1/1/71-[12/31/73]; box 3; WHCF IT; RNL.

<sup>126</sup> Noble Melencamp to Arbuthnot, March 5, 1971; GEN IT 6-3 Economic Community - Common Market (EEC) 1/1/71-[12/31/73]; box 3; WHCF IT; RNL.

<sup>127</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume XLI*, Doc. 292.

because Spain wanted assurance of American goodwill for the EC preferential agreement, but Samuels's "frank exposition of problems involved" showed the differences between the two sides.<sup>128</sup> Regardless of American opposition, Spain signed the preferential trade agreement with the EC.

The Nixon administration continued worrying over the future of Spain-E.C. relations and its effects on U.S. defensive interests in Spain. In a departing letter as Ambassador to Spain, Hill wrote to Nixon that opposition to Spain-E.C. relations could be detrimental to the United States in Spain. He revealed that the Spanish feared the United States would impose restrictions on Spanish imports, such as shoes, that would cause economic and, by proxy, political problems. Hill urged the Nixon administration to promote an idea that Spain "could benefit from the system at least until 1975, by which time their integration into the EC will have reached such a point that they could dispense with preferences from the U.S."<sup>129</sup> Hill even wrote a possible solution for the administration to follow:

We could inform the Spanish that we are prepared to support Spain diplomatically in its forthcoming attempt to obtain a commitment from the EC on ultimate full integration. Assuming Spanish willingness, under our bilateral agreement, to offer adjustments or compensation for any case of actual damage to U.S. exports, we would not press our plan to invoke GATT provisions against Spain. In return, we would expect Spain to implement the military provisions of the Agreement of Friendship and Cooperation in a full cooperative spirit. We should start this course of action as soon as possible, because it must be linked to the forthcoming renegotiation of the Spain-E.C. agreement, which is to take place in the near future.<sup>130</sup>

This letter underwent consideration by the administration and was reiterated by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. In a letter to Nixon, Laird voiced concerns that the U.S. stance

---

<sup>128</sup> "Spanish Base Negotiations," June 26, 1970; Spain Vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul 1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>129</sup> *FRUS, 1969-1976, Volume XLI*, Doc. 306.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*

in the GATT Council “may result in serious restriction on the freedom of U.S. military operations in Spain.”<sup>131</sup> Spain saw the EC agreement as a way to Europeanize, and López Bravo believed the U.S. call for Article 23 of the GATT to be “an unfriendly action.”<sup>132</sup>

This led to divisions within departments of the Nixon administration. Treasury and Agriculture favored a tough stance, Commerce and Labor wanted a moderate position to allow for flexible negotiations, and State and Defense favored a moderate approach of championing Europeanization while finding avenues for American products.<sup>133</sup> Kissinger approved taking a strong stand on principles, but stressed the importance of being reasonable in negotiations. A few months later, Kissinger and Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz wrote to Nixon that disrupting Spain-E.C. negotiations could provide increased difficulties with U.S. bases in Spain.<sup>134</sup> This saga regarding Spain and the EC is illustrative of U.S.-Spain relations. While proclaiming to Spain that it was going to try to integrate them into the West, the United States only sought to keep their defensive interests secured and fought to preserve Spanish dependence on the United States.

The Reagan administration took a similar stance and opposed Spanish acceptance to the EC for fear of its negative impact on U.S. economic interests. The administration believed the EC would offset the costs of enlargement “by either imposing a fats and oil tax or raising the duties on soybeans and products and non-grain feed ingredients.”<sup>135</sup> The United States strongly opposed any attempt by the EC to pursue such measures. In April

---

<sup>131</sup> Melvin Laird to Nixon, January 17, 1972; Spain Vol 4 Jan 1972-June 1974 (2); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Robert Hormats and Helmut Sonnenfeldt to Kissinger, April 11, 1972; Spain vol 4 Jan 1972-Jun 1974 (1); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>134</sup> *FRUS, 1973-1976, Volume E-15, Part 2, Doc. 10.*

<sup>135</sup> “Agricultura Policy Overview,” February 1986; GATT-Spain/Portugal, 1986; box 6; Edward Stucky Files, RRL.

1986, the Reagan administration filed a grievance with GATT over Spanish accession to the Community and the impact this would have on corn. The United States argued that U.S. exports of corn to Spain were \$218 million in 1985 and Spain began applying the EC's variable levy system for grains on March 1. As the principal supplier of corn to Spain, the Reagan administration claimed they were owed compensation because "these bindings have been withdrawn and replaced with the variable levy."<sup>136</sup> Despite pleas from Schultz, Secretary of Agriculture John Block, and U.S. Trade Representative Clay Yeutter, the EC did not compensate the United States for the higher tariffs. Reagan announced he had authority under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 to retaliate.<sup>137</sup> On July 2, a day after an imposed deadline, the United States and the EC settled their dispute. This was an example of the United States turning against Spain and using hard power through GATT. Like the Nixon administration, the Reagan administration superficially supported Europeanization for Spain, but made it difficult by filing a grievance shortly after ascension.

The base negotiations, entrance to NATO, and ascension to the EC all played a role in U.S. hard power with Spain. The presidential administrations planned to keep the bases no matter what the cost to Spain. They also used Spain's desperation for NATO membership against them in order to enhance U.S. national security interests. Spain's work with the EC nearly ended due to Washington's attempted interference. However, the Spanish transition to democracy dramatically changed how the United States approached Madrid. Nixon and Reagan both attempted to use the Cold War to justify

---

<sup>136</sup> "GATT Issues Concerning the EC Enlargement Talking Points," April 1986; GATT-Spain/Portugal, 1986; box 6; Edward Stucky Files, RRL.

<sup>137</sup> "White House Press Release on EC Enlargement and Taiwanese Export Performance Requirements," April 1, 1986; GATT-Spain/Portugal, 1986; box 6; Edward Stucky Files, RRL.

their use of hard power. Alongside Franco's longevity as dictator, the United States under Nixon was able to take advantage of Spain. Reagan attempted to do this, but Spain's transition to democracy prevented him from coercing Spain in the same way. González's leadership, the EC, and the NATO referendum took the hard power out of Reagan's hands. In addition, Ford and Carter had to rely more on smart power. The reason for this was because of the global perception of the transition and new political leaders.

The hard power of the United States in the transition to democracy nearly derailed U.S.-Spain relations. American exploitation of Spain during negotiations and talks with the EC and NATO did not go unnoticed by the Spanish public. As seen in the previous chapter, the Spanish public distrusted the United States because of the hard power tactics of Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan. The U.S. dominance over Spanish foreign policy bled down into the Spanish domestic perception of the United States. The base negotiations, coupled with the American response to 23-F, made it clear to Spaniards that the United States did not have their best interests at heart. Therefore, it was vital for the United States to build soft power in Spain to maintain smart power. The United States would come to rely on the United States Information Agency as well as other nongovernmental organizations to develop soft power in Spain to counterbalance the hard power.

## CHAPTER 3

### Selling “tu amigo americano”: The USIA, Public Diplomacy, and Soft Power

The United States would not exist were it not for the Spanish exploration of the Americas. This is the sentiment one discovers in reading every major speech Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan gave during state visits to and from Spain. During his trip to Madrid, Nixon provided examples of multiple U.S. cities and states with names of Spanish origin—like Bernardo de Gálvez and Galveston, Texas. He mentioned that Spanish explorers discovered America, and since then “Americans have been discovering Spain, from Washington Irving to Ernest Hemingway and the nearly million U.S. tourists who are expected to visit Spain this year.”<sup>1</sup> In his state dinner remarks, Ford mentioned Christopher Columbus “claimed America for a Spanish king and queen,” and 500 years later Juan Carlos and Sofía came to the United States to affirm “the common ideals which make all of us citizens of the western world.”<sup>2</sup> Carter emphasized historical ties to

---

<sup>1</sup> Telegraph, September 16, 1970; Presidential European Trip Vol. 1; box 466; President’s Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>2</sup> “Remarks at Toast for King Juan Carlos I of Spain with his Wife the Queen,” June 2, 1976; June 1976 - Spain - King Juan Carlos I (6) WH; box 75; Visits by Foreign Leaders File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77; GRFL.

democracy in the shared history between Spain and the United States. He stressed that the two countries “share a strong interest in democratic evolution and respect for human rights in other parts of the world,” displaying Spanish counseling of American work in Latin America, the Middle East, and parts of Africa.<sup>3</sup> Reagan explained that his home state of California was “a wonderful example of Spain’s lasting cultural gift. Catholic missions still stand in testimony to this magnificent cultural and spiritual contribution to the world. Spanish architecture is everywhere.”<sup>4</sup>

The focus of these pandering remarks on the historical ties between the United States and Spain are obvious for a few reasons. First, by showing the shared history, the administrations attempted to counterbalance the narrative that the United States propped up the Franco regime. The saga between the United States and Spain provided abundant examples for the USIA to accentuate in the distribution of the speeches. This allowed the administrations to quiet dissenting voices in Spain who argued that the base agreements kept Franco and his authoritarian regime in place. This leads to the second motive of historical ties to distract from U.S. hard power. Often the presidents gave the speeches during or after negotiations for the base agreements or treaties. These examples showed how Spain impacted the United States, and the United States intended to return the favor to Spain through the agreement—a *quid pro quo*. Third, the speeches were a method of building soft power. The administrations sought to shape soft power through the importance of Spain to the United States. While they gave these speeches in the presence

---

<sup>3</sup> “Text of the President’s Toast at Spanish State Luncheon,” June 25, 1980; Rome (Italy), Venice (Italy)—Economic Summit, Belgrad (Yugoslavia), Madrid (Spain), Lisbon (Portugal), 6/19/80; box 108; Staff Offices Press Granum; JCL.

<sup>4</sup> “Welcoming Remarks: King Juan Carlos of Spain,” October 13, 1981; [October 1981:] Carlos, King Juan of Spain (Arrival Ceremony) 10/13/1981; box 5; C. Landon Parvin Files; RRL.

of Spanish dignitaries and the press, the real audience the presidents had in mind was the Spanish public.<sup>5</sup>

Public diplomacy is one of the most versatile weapons within smart power. A country's culture may be appealing to another nation, and public diplomacy transmits this culture. Relying on the USIA, each of the presidential administrations utilized public diplomacy during the transition to democracy in Spain. The USIA concentrated on science and technology, democracy, human rights, and labor and economic rights in their public diplomacy with Spain. Official state visits were the crux of U.S. soft power to Spain before and after Franco's death. However, the USIA was careful not to upset the status quo during the Franco era. Therefore, U.S. public diplomacy in Spain did not emphasize democracy until the dictator died. Once the transition began, the USIA focused on illustrating how democracy worked, what a democratic leader looked like, and historical ties between the United States and Spain. The promotion of human and economic rights became vital to the USIA as an instrument of building soft power in Spain as it became vital to foreign policy.

However, there is a danger that public diplomacy can make soft power unattractive. If a country's culture is unappealing, the public diplomacy used will repulse and hinder soft power.<sup>6</sup> According to Nye, public diplomacy is "an instrument that governments use to mobilize ... resources to communicate with and attract the publics of other countries, rather than merely their governments."<sup>7</sup> The USIA was the agency within

---

<sup>5</sup> The USIA records for Spain often refer to a generalized "Spanish public." They geared their public diplomacy to Madrid and Castilian Spanish despite Spain having numerous regions and dialects. For this dissertation, I will use the term "Spanish public" as the USIA did, but will differentiate how public diplomacy was used in other regions, like Cataluña and the Basque region.

<sup>6</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616, no. 1 (March 2008), 108.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.



the State Department tasked with producing communications for foreign publics. Nicholas J. Cull defines public diplomacy as consisting of five core components: listening, advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, and international broadcasting.<sup>8</sup> These five factors produce soft power. The United States relied on the USIA to promote the image of America as well as historical connections to build soft power in Spain during the transition to democracy.

One other observation from the presidents' speeches is that each took a different approach to how to connect to Spain. Nixon described Spanish foundations in the United States, Ford discussed discovery, Carter portrayed democracy, and Reagan depicted the settlement of California. Each president took a different approach to the same solution—sell the Spanish public on the importance of Spain to the United States. The task of the USIA was to take these different approaches with each administration and create a cohesive public diplomacy. Nixon placed importance on preserving defensive benefits and projecting the image of a superior United States reaching out to assist Spain. Ford utilized the transition to democracy to promote Juan Carlos as the champion of democracy. Carter believed the transition to democracy was the example needed to promote human rights and unions. Reagan broadened Carter's economic rights by emphasizing consumer protections and the importance of exchanges. These different tactics provided the USIA with a variety of programs to perform in Spain to promote the United States and democracy.

### **Nixon and Ford**

Initially, the Nixon administration was hesitant to promote democracy in Spain because of the Franco regime. This reluctance stemmed from U.S. officials' desire "to

---

<sup>8</sup> Cull, *USIA*, xv.

avoid an eventual confrontation with the Spanish dictatorship.”<sup>9</sup> The administration did not want to agitate Franco and jeopardize the bilateral relationship. Though Franco named Juan Carlos as his successor, this did not mean that democracy was the next step for Spain. Further, the United States faced contempt from the Spanish public because they associated U.S. military bases in Spain with propping up the Franco regime. Stephen C. Bosworth, an economic officer at the United States Information Service (USIS) post in Madrid, explained the Spanish public, along with other European nations, were “very suspicious of the United States because they saw us as providing legitimacy for his continued rule.”<sup>10</sup> Therefore, the early public diplomacy of the Nixon administration focused on maintaining security interests. These included the official visits of Nixon to Madrid and Juan Carlos and Sofía to the United States, the importance of science and the Apollo program, and the preparation for the American Bicentennial.

In October 1970, Nixon wrapped up an event filled year with a visit to Madrid. Early in the year Spain signed the Agreement of Friendship and Cooperation and initiated reform efforts for their educational system. The administration intended the visit to promote the goodwill between the two countries, enhance Spain as a Western nation, and tie Spain to the Arab world.<sup>11</sup> Nixon had private meetings planned with Franco, Juan Carlos and Sofía, and Carrero Blanco. Though opposed to promoting Spanish democracy, U.S. officials emphasized building a rapport with Franco’s successors. In a memo detailing the personalities involved, the State Department appeared most interested in

---

<sup>9</sup> Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, “Estados Unidos, ¿soporte del franquismo o germen de la democracia?” in *La apertura internacional de España*, 267-8. Translated by author.

<sup>10</sup> Interview with Stephen C. Bosworth, February 24, 2003, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>11</sup> “Presidential Travel,” September 16, 1970; Presidential European Trip Vol. 1; box 466; President’s Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

developing good relations with the prince, princess, and the vice president as opposed to Franco. In a memo to Kissinger, Juan Carlos is described as “pro-American”—though referred to as King Juan III—and a “stabilizing force during the transition, and so it will be important for you to develop a warm relationship with him.”<sup>12</sup> The State Department illustrated the importance of Carrero Blanco as the future head of government, and underscored his importance in the successful conclusion of the base agreement.

The news coverage of Nixon’s visit presented a range of responses. In a letter to the president, Alan Brown—a Navy officer in Spain—detailed how the Embassy and the Spanish government covered the trip. Brown praised the efforts of the Spanish for the coverage on various media outlets, including the television news. He described the programs as “beautifully handled,” and greatly enjoyed the reference to Eisenhower calling Nixon “his boy.” The news commentator then said: “And with all respect to the President of the United States, I might say: Mr. President, you are our boy too. Welcome to you and Mrs. Nixon, and may God give you both many years of happiness.”<sup>13</sup> Though some appeared happy with the Spanish coverage, others were livid with the American treatment. Tony Janak, a Columbia Records engineer, voiced his outrage in a letter to Nixon’s Personal Secretary Rose Mary Woods. In the letter, Janak expressed outrage over the American media and Nixon’s visit to Spain. He explained that CBS “used about 90 minutes to demean Spain [and] Franco,” NBC showed only eight minutes of Nixon’s visit and relied on commentaries from David Brinkley and Sandy Vanocur, and ABC did

---

<sup>12</sup> To Kissinger from Peter M. Rodman, September 25, 1970; Presidential European Trip Vol. III [1of2]; box 467; President’s Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>13</sup> To Nixon from Alan Brown, October 4, 1970; EX CO 139 Spain [1969-1970]; box 66; WHCF CO; RNL.

not carry the satellite reports.<sup>14</sup> Janak continued to rail against Brinkley and Vanocur by saying it was “sad to hear the commentators talk as if they were working for a foreign information agency.”<sup>15</sup> Though the media reaction to Nixon’s visit was a mixed bag, the visit of the Spanish prince and princess to America appeared to show the early popularity of the couple.

Juan Carlos and Sofia visited the United States in 1971. The Spanish royalty visited the Naval Academy in Annapolis, Quantico, Southern California, Texas, and Florida, met with administration and government officials in D.C., and witnessed the launch of Apollo XIV. The Spanish Embassy gave a dinner in honor of Juan Carlos and Sofia with guests that included prominent politicians, businessmen, academics, and the press. Roger Ailes suggested Joan King, a television reporter from Houston who had interviewed Juan Carlos before, be invited because she is “very popular generally in the Southwest” and knows Juan Carlos personally.<sup>16</sup> Following the Spanish royalty’s return to Madrid, Ambassador Robert Hill detailed the Spanish reaction to Juan Carlos and Sofia’s visit. Hill explained that Spaniards appreciated the reception the prince and princess received in the United States, adding that “even my barber gave me a warm abrazo which, as you know, is almost unheard of in Spain.”<sup>17</sup> Hill elaborated that the trip to the United States boosted the political image of Juan Carlos in Spain. The visit gave

---

<sup>14</sup> From Tony Janak, October 5, 1970; GEN TR 57-3 Spain; box 45; WHCF TR; RNL.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> To Klein from Haldeman, January 13, 1971; Dinner and Entertainment, Prince Juan Carlos and Princess of Spain, Tuesday, Jan. 26, 1971 [2 of 2]; box 129; White House Social Events, President's Personal File; RNL.

<sup>17</sup> To Nixon from Robert Hill, February 19, 1971; EX CO 139 Spain 1/1/1971- [1 of 2]; box 66; WHCF CO; RNL.

“his image a much more serious dimension and caused most Spaniards to feel pride in him through the high level attentions which he received.”<sup>18</sup>

The visits of Nixon to Madrid and Juan Carlos and Sofia to the United States are important to the USIA’s mission with Spain as well as representative of the Nixon administration’s approach to Spain. These stopovers offered publicity and an example to show the world of the two countries’ rapport. The Nixon visit displayed that the United States planned to continue working with Spain even after Franco as evidenced in meetings with Juan Carlos and Carrero Blanco. The visit of Juan Carlos and Sofia to the United States held advantages for both countries. It provided the USIA with a way to covertly promote the emerging democratic leaders of Spain and offered Spain a global stage to show off their future leader. Yet, while the two visits are ways to establish public diplomacy, they also exhibited that the United States intended to continue their Cold War defense prerogatives in the Mediterranean. The Nixon visit came on the heels of the base agreement, and the Spanish royal visit suggested the status quo would continue after Franco.

The public diplomacy efforts of the Nixon administration included promotion of the Apollo space program and astronaut goodwill tours. The Apollo space program gave the USIA an opportunity to promote science education and space abroad. Cull argues that the high point of USIA during the Nixon administration was the July 1969 coverage of Apollo XI. He highlights that the Voice of America offered live coverage in four languages, broadcast to an estimated 800 million, created a European Apollo News Center operated with National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

prepared 125 exhibits around the world.<sup>19</sup> The USIA estimated that over half the world's population interacted with the Apollo XI landing via the radio, television, or news articles. Television viewership was an unprecedented audience around 500 million people worldwide.<sup>20</sup> The USIA believed the landing of Apollo XI boosted the global standing of the United States, and it became important for the United States to continue leveraging this new public image. Avenues to accomplish this involved airing television specials of subsequent Apollo missions and sending the astronauts on a goodwill tour.

The USIA targeted Spain for space public diplomacy because of a variety of factors. One of these dealt with the relationship between NASA and Spain. There was an extensive NASA establishment in Spain, and NASA sought an extension of its arrangement in Spain through 1984.<sup>21</sup> For example, NASA and the Instituto Nacional de Técnica Aeroespacial “has also been directed toward sounding rocket studies of the upper atmosphere and ionosphere,” and Spanish scientists at the Nuclear Energy Board “received a lunar surface sample for detailed studies.”<sup>22</sup> Often, Nixon and Franco would exchange friendly messages after each successful Apollo mission. In a suggested line for the toast during his Madrid visit, Nixon would have said: “The importance of our scientific cooperation is exemplified by the Spanish space tracking facilities. Manned by both U.S. and Spanish engineers, the facilities have made a great contribution to the Apollo flights, whose achievements we consider as being shared by all mankind.”<sup>23</sup> In

---

<sup>19</sup> Cull, *USIA*, 305.

<sup>20</sup> Teasel Muir-Harmony, “Selling Space Capsules, Moon Rocks, and America: Spaceflight in U.S. Public Diplomacy, 1961-1979” in *Reasserting America in the 1970s*, 133

<sup>21</sup> Conversation between Kissinger and Aguirre de Carcer, May 16, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>22</sup> Briefing Book for Madrid Visit, October 2, 1970; Visit of Richard Nixon Briefing Book Spain; box 468; President's Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>23</sup> To Kissinger from Helmut Sonnenfeldt, September 21, 1970; Presidential European Trip Vol. III [1of2]; box 466; President's Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

regards to exhibits, Spain held a National Space Week Seminar in 1968 at the School of Industrial Engineering of the University of Barcelona. USIA provided exhibition hall materials such as an Apollo capsule and numerous Gemini photographs.<sup>24</sup> In addition, a 68-gram moon rock attracted 41,000 spectators in Madrid and Barcelona. Though foot traffic was sparse initially, a word-of-mouth campaign brought 21,000 to Madrid, and “lavish press coverage” contributed to 20,000 visiting the rock at the Atarazanas Reales de Barcelona.<sup>25</sup>

A second factor for space public diplomacy in Spain was the interest of Juan Carlos and Sofía in NASA. They were avid supporters of the government organization, and, during their visit to the United States, a visit to Cape Kennedy. In a letter to a State Department official, Vice Admiral James Calvert doted on Juan Carlos and Sofía, especially for their interest in science and space exploration. Calvert wrote that Juan Carlos seemed knowledgeable about the American space program, but Sofía impressed him the most. He detailed how she was “an absolute dynamo of information about the American nuclear submarine program, the American space program, the world energy problem, and the need for greater interest in engineering and technology within the Spanish educational tradition.”<sup>26</sup> The future king and queen’s interest in science and technology helped both tailor public diplomacy and the Nixon administration in connecting with the leadership of post-Franco Spain.

---

<sup>24</sup> IV National Space Week Seminar, March 13, 1968; SP - Space and Astronautics 1968; box 55; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>25</sup> Monthly Highlights, April 1970; May 20, 1970; EDX 2 General Reports and Statistics, Spain, 1968; box 240; Individual Countries, Western Europe, Country Files, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (hereby referred to as CU); University of Arkansas Libraries (hereby referred to as UAL).

<sup>26</sup> James Calvert to Henry McCown, October 24, 1972; POL 15-1 - Juan Carlos 1972; box 13; Records relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

To reach the broadest audience, the USIA utilized television to distribute information about the Apollo space program. On numerous occasions throughout the year, USIS Madrid played documentaries about space or science on TVE, which was a service of the state-owned media Corporación de Radio y Televisión Española (RTVE). For example, USIS Madrid placed fifteen shows on TVE in December 1970, including several Science Reports and Apollo XIV training programs.<sup>27</sup> Spain continued to be a place in which the American space program received positive coverage. USIS continued to air the takeoffs, such as in August 1971 when TVE picked up both blast off and landing of Apollo XV. The USIS post relayed that the press “proved lavish, both in news coverage and in editorial praise of the latest U.S. space success.”<sup>28</sup> The next month, Dr. Charles A. Berry, the Director of Life Sciences for NASA, held a press conference sponsored by USIS Madrid, and two-dozen media members attended it.<sup>29</sup>

A second method the USIA used with Spain was the astronaut goodwill tours. The Nixon administration received several requests from embassies, ambassadors, and other foreign service workers for official visits to their respective countries. As Teasel Muir-Harmony explains, the astronauts served as Nixon’s “personal representatives,” especially the Apollo XI crew that toured over twenty countries.<sup>30</sup> Spain was no different. The Nixon administration produced an initial tour outline in August 1969 that left Madrid off. However, Peter Flannigan wrote to Dr. Thomas O. Paine, administrator of NASA, to

---

<sup>27</sup> Monthly Highlights: December 1970, January 13, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>28</sup> Monthly Highlights: August 1971, September 16, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>29</sup> Monthly Highlights: September 1971, October 14, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>30</sup> Muir-Harmony, 134.



add Madrid as a stop.<sup>31</sup> Though motorcades were not normal in Madrid, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said “they will assist fulling in working out something of this kind.”<sup>32</sup> Walter Cunningham from Apollo VII also made a stopover. Cunningham visited the U.S. Consulates in Barcelona and Madrid in December 1971 to inaugurate the IX Salon de la Infancia y de la Juventud in Barcelona. Further, Cunningham appeared on television and provided the Ministry of Tourism with a memento from one of the Apollo missions.<sup>33</sup>

Space public diplomacy and astronaut goodwill tours were vital portions of the USIA’s goals both globally and in Spain. The success of the Apollo program and subsequent goodwill tours gave the USIA a much-needed contrast and distraction from the Vietnam War. By broadcasting to the world and sending astronauts to visit foreign dignitaries, the USIA flaunted the superiority of the United States in the space race against the Soviet Union. In Spain, space public diplomacy and astronaut tours had a dual endgame. It presented the USIA with a way to build a rapport with the Spanish public. The Nixon administration faced an uphill battle with the Spaniards who detested the U.S. relationship with Franco as well as American Cold War aggression. Juan Carlos and Sofía’s support for space programs at home and abroad excited the USIA with possibilities. Further, the success of Apollo and the astronauts gave the USIA a way to promote science and education to the Spanish public. Through a variety of mediums, including museum exhibits, television, and public visits from astronauts.

---

<sup>31</sup> To Thomas O. Paine from Peter Flannigan, August 26, 1969; Spain Programs Foreign Cooperation (1970) (1); box 392; Subject Files, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>32</sup> Telegraph, September 4, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (1); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>33</sup> Robert Zimmermann to George Landau, December 23, 1971; POL 2-2 - Barcelona 1971-1972; box 12; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

The death of Franco initiated a change in power relations for Ford, it also forced the USIA to change their approach. Once the transition began in 1975, the Ford administration maintained a similar approach to public diplomacy in Spain as Nixon—continue cordial relations with Franco to guard security interests. However, Ford initiated a change in public diplomacy due to the death of the dictator. While attempting to protect the military bases, U.S. public diplomacy was “mobilized to approach the protagonists of the democratic reforms in Spain, as it had previously tried” during the Franco regime.<sup>34</sup> Such an initiative had a renewed chance of success in the wake of Franco’s death. The USIA put forward two major efforts for Spain: the first official trip of Juan Carlos abroad as monarch and Spanish involvement with the Bicentennial. First, the United States looked to overhaul the image of Spain abroad by inviting Juan Carlos and Sofia on their first official trip as King and Queen of Spain. Even though Juan Carlos visited the United States in 1971 to much praise, there were still questions of whether he was capable of leading Spain into the post-Franco era.

While the first months of the transition were precarious, Juan Carlos and Ford continued to cultivate and broaden U.S.-Spanish relations. To mitigate global skepticism about the political skills of the King of Spain, the Spanish and United States governments discussed a possible approach to calm these conjectures by bringing the new leader to Washington. This would be Juan Carlos’s first official trip abroad as monarch, and he would be meeting with Spain’s greatest ally on their soil. The purpose for the United States in this visit was “to demonstrate our full support for the King and, by extension,

---

<sup>34</sup> Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, “Estados Unidos,” 301.

the democratic evolution to which he is committed.”<sup>35</sup> Juan Carlos wanted the visit “to strengthen his position at home through the prestige of being received in Washington as an important leader,” which would be the first time a Spanish foreign leader visited the United States.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, the outing provided excellent public diplomacy opportunities for both Spain and the United States.

Second, the U.S. Bicentennial was an important objective of the USIA during the Ford administration. In the early 1970s, the United States faced a few challenges because of events like the Vietnam War and Watergate. The USIA viewed the Bicentennial as “an opportunity to ‘re-boot’ the international image of America, reminding the world of the fundamental values of the republic.”<sup>37</sup> Education played a role during the Bicentennial as well. As Cull explains, the Bicentennial “energized” the American Studies programs around the globe, from Helsinki to Tehran to Indonesia.<sup>38</sup> In Spain, cultural centers throughout the country emphasized the study of the United States. Specifically, in 1976, the Spanish Association of Anglo-North American Studies (AEDEAN) was established, and its founders connected with English philology studies.<sup>39</sup> Another important aspect of the American Bicentennial was the visits of foreign leaders. During the Bicentennial,

---

<sup>35</sup> Memorandum, Jeanne Davis to Susan Porter, 27 May 1976, folder: June 1976 – Spain – King Juan Carlos (3) WH, box 75, Visits by Foreign Leaders File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>36</sup> Memorandum, “State Visit of King Juan Carlos of Spain,” undated, folder: June 1976 – Spain – King Juan Carlos I (4) WH, box 75, Visits by Foreign Leaders File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>37</sup> Nicholas J. Cull, “The Devil at the Crossroads: USIA and American Public Diplomacy in the 1970s,” in *Reasserting America in the 1970s*, 28.

<sup>38</sup> Cull, *USIA*, 358.

<sup>39</sup> Sylvia L. Hilton, “The Study of U.S. History in Spain” in *Teaching and Studying U.S. History in Europe: Past, Present and Future* eds. Cornelis A. van Minnen and Sylvia L. Hilton (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2007), 245.

several foreign heads of state traveled to present gifts or tour the country including the king and queen of Spain.<sup>40</sup>

For Spain, the arrival of Juan Carlos and Sofía demonstrated the importance of Spain in American history, but it also demonstrated to the world that the United States supported the new leaders of Spain. Upon their arrival on June 1, 1976, Juan Carlos and Sofía attended several Washington galas and Bicentennial events in Washington and New York City. On their first night in Washington, the Ford administration invited the Spanish monarchs to a white tie dinner at the White House where Juan Carlos and Sofía requested the attendance of such guests as Mario Andretti, Jack Nicklaus, Charles Bronson, Raquel Welch, and Neil Armstrong. Ford delivered a toast to the monarch at the Spanish embassy that summed up the importance of Juan Carlos's visit. In his speech, Ford emphasized the relevance of Spain to American history, but he stressed the importance of Spain now to Western and trans-Atlantic defense. Ford observed how Juan Carlos hoped the "visit would contribute to reinforcing the bonds of friendship between us for the good of our two countries and all those who aspire to attain the ideals of faith, freedom, and justice."<sup>41</sup>

In addition, Juan Carlos addressed a joint session of Congress where he spoke in perfect English and emphasized the importance of the United States to Spain. Juan Carlos began by discussing the Bicentennial, and the Spanish history of the United States. He discussed how "the Spanish pioneers of the 16th century, who in less than 50 years

---

<sup>40</sup> M. Todd Bennett, "Time to Heal the Wounds: America's Bicentennial and U.S.-Sweden Normalization in 1976," in *Reasserting America in the 1970s*, 221.

<sup>41</sup> Speech, June 3, 1976, folder: "6/3/76 - Remarks at Toast for King Juan Carlos I of Spain and his Wife the Queen During a Reciprocal Dinner at the Spanish Embassy," box 34, President's Speeches and Statements: Reading Copies, 1974-77, GRFL.

explored in their fragile primitive ships all the Rio Grande to Cape Breton.”<sup>42</sup> Juan Carlos then turned to the importance of democracy, not just in the United States but in Spain as well. He explained that the Spanish monarchy “will insure, under the principles of democracy, that social peace and political stability are maintained in Spain,” and that the Crown “protects the whole people and each and every one of its citizens, guaranteeing through the laws and by the exercise of civil liberties the rule of justice.”<sup>43</sup> In addition, Juan Carlos even hinted that Spain intended to integrate into Europe. With the discussions in the White House and the speech to Congress, Juan Carlos showed his diplomatic abilities and embodied the transition in Spanish policies.

During the remaining days of their official visit, the Spanish monarchs had several other dedications and events to attend in both Washington and New York for the Bicentennial. Over seventeen art exhibits underscored the importance of Spanish-American heritage and relations throughout the country. Juan Carlos and Sofia inaugurated the Christopher Columbus exhibit at the Smithsonian and the Santa María de Atocha exhibit at the National Geographic Society in Washington, dedicated statues of Don Quijote and Bernardo de Gálvez in Washington, visited the new Casa de España in New York, and planned “to lay a wreath at the monument to Spanish martyrs of the American Revolutionary War in Brooklyn.”<sup>44</sup> Spanish Ambassador Jaime Alba explained the statue of de Galvez was “a gift-project of the Government of Spain in recognition of

---

<sup>42</sup> “Address by King Juan Carlos II of Spain Before Joint Meeting of the House and Senate,” June 2, 1976; Spain, 1975-76; box 9; Series 19: Foreign Affairs and National Security, Nelson Rockefeller Vice Presidential Records; RAC.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Jeanne Davis to Susan Porter, May 27, 1976, folder: June 1976 – Spain – King Juan Carlos (3) WH, box 75, Visits by Foreign Leaders File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

the Bicentennial celebrations.”<sup>45</sup> There were other Bicentennial events throughout the year Juan Carlos and Sofía did not participate in, which highlighted the importance of Spain to U.S. history. For example, Ohio celebrated the Day of the Two Toledos, several Columbus Day celebrations throughout the country, and Hispanic Heritage Week during September 12-19, 1976.

Following the departure of the Spanish monarchs, the United States seemed to reach a consensus on the success of the visit. Ford wrote Juan Carlos to thank him for his gifts, his participation in the Bicentennial events, and to emphasize “the important role Spain has played in the development of our country.”<sup>46</sup> The American public seemed enthralled with the young king. An editorial in the *New York Times* saw Juan Carlos’s visit to the United States as an indication of “his readiness to assume in full the role assigned to him by [Areilza] as the ‘motor of change’ that will bring democracy to Spain.”<sup>47</sup> Journalist C.L. Sulzberger explained how for “the first time in four decades it was demonstrated that the head of Spain could travel freely. And, seizing the occasion, Juan Carlos pledged himself to a goal of democracy, civil liberties and a multiparty system.”<sup>48</sup> Juan Carlos’s visit had great impact in Spain as well. As historian Angel Viñas explains, the “American slap on the back helped to leave behind as quickly as possible the footprint of the Franco years.”<sup>49</sup> Yet, some were still skeptical, such as Vermont Royster at the *Wall Street Journal*. He explains that Juan Carlos and Sofía’s visit “has a fairy-tale quality about it—the coming to life of the handsome young king and his

---

<sup>45</sup> Jaime Alba to James A. Cannon, May 18, 1976, folder: CO 139 4/1/76-5/31/76, box 47, CO 139, Subject File, White House Central Files, GRFL.

<sup>46</sup> Ford to Juan Carlos I, June 15, 1976, folder: Spain, 1976 (4) WH, box 22, Country File, National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77, GRFL.

<sup>47</sup> “A King for Democracy,” *New York Times* June 4, 1976.

<sup>48</sup> “U.S. Mirror in Spain,” C.L. Sulzberger, *New York Times* June 16, 1976.

<sup>49</sup> Viñas, *En las garras del águila*, 440.

beautiful queen—that makes you wonder if you are tricked by an illusion which will suddenly vanish in a puff of smoke.”<sup>50</sup>

The importance of Juan Carlos in the Spanish transition to democracy and his role in marshaling U.S.-Spain relations during this turbulent period cannot be overemphasized. He was a groundbreaker, not a figurehead in the transition. This contrasts with other countries within the Third Wave of Democracy. The Carnation Revolution saw a military coup in Lisbon overthrow the Estado Novo to begin a process towards democratization. Greece underwent a transition after the fall of the military junta following student uprisings and a failed coup d'état of Cyprus. For Spain, the death of Franco could have led to similar uprisings, but the perseverance of Juan Carlos led the country towards constitutional monarchy. For the United States, Juan Carlos represented the path towards democracy for other nations coming through the Third Wave. Therefore, the USIA and the Ford administration found it vital to promote Juan Carlos and provide an example of how a transition to democracy should occur in a peaceful manner.

### **Carter and Reagan**

Public diplomacy during the Carter administration built upon the themes of Ford's promotion of democracy, but also emphasized human rights and labor unions. The USIA—which underwent a name change to the ICA—continued work on the Bicentennial, which carried over from Ford. According to the ICA, over 100 governments allocated \$100 million to commemorate the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.<sup>51</sup> Spain was no different as they planned to observe anniversaries in the 1980s for their role in the American Revolution. California had blueprints for a few

---

<sup>50</sup> “Thinking Things Over: The Reign in Spain,” Vermont Royster, *Wall Street Journal*, June 2, 1976.

<sup>51</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume XXX, Public Diplomacy* eds. Kristin L. Ahlberg and Adam M. Howard (Washington: United States Government Publishing Office, 2016), Doc. 92.

events to celebrate the state's Bicentennial and wanted Juan Carlos and Sofia to be major figures in the celebrations. In a letter to Carter, Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley detailed that the city planned events beginning on September 4, 1980 and intended to commemorate historic and cultural ties to Spain and Mexico. Bradley asked if Carter would "consider extending a formal invitation to Their Majesties to visit the United States and the City of Los Angeles sometime during this period."<sup>52</sup> Further, the cities of Santa Barbara and Monterey planned Bicentennial events in the hopes of enticing Juan Carlos and Sofia. Paul Mills, the director of the Santa Barbara Museum of Art, wrote to Carter that the museum planned a major international exhibit in conjunction with the Prado Museum. The exhibition, "The Age of Carlos III in Spain and New Spain" used a series of grants under the cultural provisions of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between Spain and the United States.<sup>53</sup>

However, the dominant theme within the Carter administration's public diplomacy dealt with human rights, most obviously with human rights rhetoric. Carter used the ICA to promote human rights through his speeches at his inauguration, at the United Nations (UN), and at the Organization of American States (OAS).<sup>54</sup> However, the definition and promotion of human rights were not consistent throughout Carter's tenure. As Barbara Keys highlights, nothing underscores "the novelty of human rights in American foreign policy firmament more than the Carter administration's profound

---

<sup>52</sup> Letter from Tom Bradley to Jimmy Carter, November 6, 1978; CO 145 Executive 1/20/77-12/31/79; box CO-54; WHCF; JCL.

<sup>53</sup> Letter from Paul Mills to Jimmy Carter, June 30, 1980; CO 145 Executive 1/20/77-12/31/79; box CO-54; WHCF; JCL.

<sup>54</sup> Cull, *USIA*, 374.



confusion over what human rights promotion meant in practice.”<sup>55</sup> This can be seen through the State Department and ICA struggle over the definition of human rights.

The State Department believed in specific objectives for human rights. It should promote civil and political liberties; support basic needs like food, health care, and education; endorse international humanitarian programs; and publicize to other nations the U.S. stance on human rights.<sup>56</sup> The ICA in contrast argued that human rights should “reflect historic American concerns,” as well as economic and social issues.<sup>57</sup> One reason for this stance was that Western Europeans increasingly viewed human rights as “an essential component of being culturally ‘European.’”<sup>58</sup> In addition, the ICA intended to encompass research from NGOs that advocate for human rights, like Amnesty International. Though the two agencies had different approaches to human rights, the Carter administration sought to come to terms for a singular, interdepartmental definition of human rights in August 1977. From an inter-agency document, a three-part definition of human rights occurred,

First, the right to be free from governmental violations of the integrity of the person: such violations include torture; cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment and punishment; arbitrary arrest or imprisonment; denial of fair public trial; and invasion of the home (‘the first group’). Second, economic and social rights: the right to be free from government action or inaction which either obstructs an individual’s efforts to fulfill his vital needs for food, shelter, health care, and education or fails adequately to support the individual in meeting basic needs (‘the second group’). Third, civil and political liberties: these include freedom of thought, of religion, of assembly, of speech, of the press; freedom of movement both within and outside one’s own country; and freedom to take part in government (‘the third group’).<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Keys, *Reclaiming American Virtue*, 5.

<sup>56</sup> *FRUS, 1977–1980, Volume II*, Doc. 54.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, Doc. 60.

<sup>58</sup> Borstelmann, *The 1970s*, 185.

<sup>59</sup> *FRUS, 1977–1980, Volume II*, Doc 73.

The role of the ICA became to promote human rights rhetoric through radio, print, and television as opposed to developing policy. As Keys illustrates, Carter and Brzezinski “compromised the social points of the public diplomacy component of human rights promotion, with the [ICA] playing a small supporting role in disseminating these statements and interpreting them for foreign publics.”<sup>60</sup> The ICA did not participate as much in the creation of the human rights rhetoric as simply becoming a vessel for Carter’s messages.

This contrasts with Nixon and Ford who relied on USIA to produce public diplomacy and not just be the messenger. This is best seen in their approaches to Spain. For Nixon, the USIA provided the administration with their programming for space public diplomacy as well as disseminating information during official state visits. For Ford, the USIA offered several Bicentennial events that depicted the importance of Spain to the United States. Yet, for Carter, the now ICA became a loudspeaker. The ICA would disseminate speeches in Spain that detailed Carter’s foreign policy or whenever Spain’s transition to democracy helped his human rights rhetoric. It would not be until later in the administration that the ICA began pushing initiatives with economic rights. However, the diminishing role of the ICA did not stop the agency from providing the administration ideas.

In late 1977, the new director of the ICA, John Reinhardt, suggested Carter give a ten- to fifteen-minute speech to commemorate Human Rights Week in December 1977. Reinhardt suggested a deliberative speech on human rights because he was aware of the criticism the president faced due to U.S. discrepancies such as “that we are not thoughtful

---

<sup>60</sup> Barbara Keys, “‘Something to Boast About’: Western Enthusiasm for Carter’s Human Rights Diplomacy,” in *Reasserting America in the 1970s*, 230.

enough, that we've been inconsistent, that we back off from the tough choices.”<sup>61</sup>

Brzezinski approved the ICA drafting a speech for Carter. In the speech, there are connections to U.S. history—especially the American Revolution—and to democracy. Nods to the Spanish transition occurred in the democracy portion. The speech highlights that democracy appeared doomed in the world, but “there is a perceptible swing of the pendulum” back towards democracy among several countries led by Spain.<sup>62</sup> Carter gave a televised speech regarding Human Rights Day and Human Rights Week, but it did not happen until 1978 from the East Room.

The draft of the televised Human Rights Day speech illustrates the integral part of the Spanish transition to democracy to Carter's human rights rhetoric. Carter often used the Spanish transition to democracy as a parallel to American style of democracy. He referenced the Spanish transition often in his major speeches on human rights. For example, in his most famous speech on human rights at Notre Dame, Carter spoke of democratic methods and the importance of democracy promotion in U.S. foreign policy. He explained,

I believe we can have a foreign policy that is democratic, that is based on fundamental values, and that uses power and influence, which we have, for humane purposes. We can also have a foreign policy that the American people both support and, for a change, know about and understand. I have a quiet confidence in our own political system. Because we know that democracy works, we can reject the arguments of those rulers who deny human rights to their people. We are confident that democracy's example will be compelling, and so we seek to bring that example closer to those from whom in the past few years we have been separated and who are not yet convinced about the advantages of our

---

<sup>61</sup> Drafted Memo from John Reinhardt to Jimmy Carter, December 1, 1977; USIA; box 6; Barry Jagoda's Subject Files, Barry Jagoda Papers, JCL.

<sup>62</sup> John Reinhardt to Zbigniew Brzezinski and Barry Jagoda, November 29, 1977; NSC; box 3; Barry Jagoda's Subject Files, Barry Jagoda Papers; JCL; Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Adviser, 1977-1981* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983), 127.

kind of life. We are confident that the democratic methods are the most effective, and so we are not tempted to employ improper tactics here at home or abroad.<sup>63</sup>

Spain received mention in this speech with this emphasis on praising democracy abroad and human rights. Carter said that the recent global successes in democracy, like Spain, “show that our confidence in this system is not misplaced.”<sup>64</sup> The president believed that support for dictatorships was against American idealism, and human rights and democracy demanded a belief in change and diversity internationally.<sup>65</sup>

Another example of promoting Spanish democracy was advocating Spain as the next location for the meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This organization started its operations after the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, and the Carter administration promoted it whenever they could. Mondale spoke highly of the CSCE at an address at NATO headquarters. He described that both “seeking the full implementation of the Helsinki agreement and searching for further ways to improve security and cooperation in Europe are vital.”<sup>66</sup> Further, Carter made statements allying Spain with the CSCE. He explained the United States supported Spanish efforts to strengthen democratic institutions and wanted to work closely with Europe at the CSCE.<sup>67</sup> In addition, the CSCE pursued a new city to hold the next meeting. Spain desired to be the location and submitted Madrid to be the select city. The CSCE meeting appeared to give “a certain fillip to the new political system in Spain.”<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume I, Foundations of Foreign Policy* eds. Kristin L. Ahlberg and Adam M. Howard (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2014), Doc. 40.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> David F. Schmitz, *Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 300-1.

<sup>66</sup> *FRUS, 1977-1980, Volume I*, Doc. 16.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, Doc. 29.

<sup>68</sup> Viñas, “Breaking the Shackles,” 253.

One major initiative the Carter administration pushed alongside human rights was economic rights in Spain. This included labor and the promotion of unions. After the legalization of unions and the right to strike in 1976, the United States increased information and educational activities to develop and spread democratic unions. In January 1978, Brzezinski approached Reinhardt to expand these endeavors. Reinhardt discussed activities in progress such as: leader grants for the General Union of Workers representatives, seminars in Barcelona and Madrid on arbitration, ICA grants of \$35,000, cooperation with AFL-CIO to recruit Spanish-speaking specialists to visit Spain, encouragement of youths in labor, Spanish language copies of “A Brief History of the American Labor Movement,” and ICA films on labor sent to Spanish unions.<sup>69</sup> Further, Reinhardt discussed ICA’s plans beyond 1979 including: increase of labor leader grants, more direct union-to-union contact, seminars led by Spanish-speaking American labor specialists, youth exchanges for young labor leaders, Labor ministry seminars organized and financed by the International Labor Affairs Bureau, and more translations of labor documents.<sup>70</sup> Reinhardt provided an in-depth analysis of the budget for ICA’s Spanish labor initiatives later that month. Union-to-union contacts, leader grants, and youth exchanges received the most funding. However, he pointed to university exchanges in this memo as a possible inconvenience. The existing exchange programs like Fulbright and the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation provided many opportunities, but it was “unwise to press Spanish representatives of essentially academic programs to move into

---

<sup>69</sup> John Reinhardt to Zbigniew Brzezinski, July 5, 1978; Spain, 1/77-8/79; box 72; Country Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

the labor education field.”<sup>71</sup> The Madrid Embassy often had luncheons where it would invite labor leaders from both countries, specifically socialists. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Robert E. Barbour describes these labor leaders and socialists as “these wild bearded people who didn’t wear neckties,” but the luncheons were the two sides “just pushing and helping, trying to show that the United States was not hostile” towards labor or the PSOE.<sup>72</sup>

In a memo to Brzezinski a year later, Reinhardt provided a follow-up to the ICA’s assistance on Spanish labor. The AFL-CIO sent representatives to several unions including steelworkers, carpenters, municipal employees, and factory workers, and Spanish unions sent Socialist, Basque, and other political affiliations to the United States. Several labor specialists and academics travelled to Spain for educational programs and to lead seminars.<sup>73</sup> The United States gave twelve leader grants to labor leaders, and Spain received six young American labor leaders. In addition, the ICA post in Madrid published a Spanish version of the U.S. Department of Labor’s “U.S. Labor Bulletin” and several booklets about North American labor movements.<sup>74</sup> Reinhardt argued the most successful element of ICA’s labor efforts was a series of seminars sponsored by American and Spanish Departments of Labor, which included seminars on “trade unions, management, government and academia.”<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> John Reinhardt to Zbigniew Brzezinski, July 28, 1978; Spain, 1/77-8/79; box 72; Country Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>72</sup> Interview with Barbour.

<sup>73</sup> These include James Farmer, Executive Director of the Coalition of Public Employees; David Helfield, Professor at the University of Puerto Rico; Jack Barbash, Professor at the University of Wisconsin; and Roy Godsen, Labor Professor at Georgetown University.

<sup>74</sup> John Reinhardt to Zbigniew Brzezinski, September 25, 1979; Spain, 9/79-1/80; box 72; Country Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

The emphasis on labor practices represents the United States attempting to draw parallels between the Spanish and American practices under a democracy. However, this was a longstanding initiative of the USIA dating back to the early Cold War. The policymakers of these early administrations associated capitalism with the United States as a combatant to the Soviet Union and communism. The Carter administration repurposed this initiative to fit the recently legalized unions in Spain. One reason for this program dealt with the administration's definition of human rights, which lists economic rights as one aspect of the three-part definition. Another reason for this dealt with the fears that the Socialist and Communist parties of Spain may associate themselves more with the Soviet Union. Further, the early Cold War initiatives of the USIA promoted labor leaders to show the harmony of American domestic support for unions. The ICA again recycled by promoting leader grants and exchanges between Spanish and American labor leaders.

Along with human rights rhetoric and labor, the Carter administration used an official state visit in 1980 to promote American style democracy in Spain and signify Spain's importance both culturally and defensively to the United States. The NSC emphasized Carter's trip to Italy, Spain, and Portugal was important to public perception of the President's leadership, especially during the ongoing crisis in Iran. Particularly with Spain, the United States "could point up the practical results of the President's human rights campaign, identifying him personally with the democratic experiments under way" in Spain.<sup>76</sup> Therefore, the United States attempted to promote Juan Carlos and the newest democracy in Europe, and simultaneously recover the image of Carter

---

<sup>76</sup> Jim Rentschler to Zbigniew Brzezinski, April 9, 1979; CO 145 Executive 1/20/77-12/31/79; box CO-54; WHCF; JCL.

abroad. Brzezinski and Barbour floated the idea of giving the Spanish king the Medal of Freedom. Barbour argued the person that most embodied the transition was Juan Carlos—only vaguely hinting at the work of Suárez—and that “singling him out would be recognized in Spain ... as a tribute to what the entire country has accomplished since Franco’s death.”<sup>77</sup> While the Medal of Freedom idea never materialized, it indicated a path the Carter administration sought to connect the Spanish transition to the United States. However, a toast the president made in Madrid made this connection more relevant.

Carter’s speech drew a variety of correlations between the democracy of the United States and the Spanish transition. Carter spent much of the speech equating Spain to America, but he also discussed Spain’s logical step toward Europeanization with entry into the EC. Carter emphasized how Spain “created a vigorous, thriving democracy, with respect for human rights, individual liberties, and freedom of expression.”<sup>78</sup> These attributes were how the Carter administration perceived their foreign policy on the world stage. In addition, the president underscored the importance of the Spanish transition on the Third World. Spain “is a source of hope and inspiration to democrats everywhere. Spain’s experience holds lessons about resolution, moderation, and self-control.”<sup>79</sup> Much to the relief of the Carter administration, the Spanish government tied their human rights crusade to the United States. In an ICA translation of the Spanish government’s announcement of Carter’s visit, Spain emphasized the importance Carter placed on Spain

---

<sup>77</sup> Telegram from Robert Barbour to Zbigniew Brzezinski, May 29, 1980; Spain: 4-9/80; box 49; Office Country and Subject Chron Files, NSA Brzezinski Material; JCL.

<sup>78</sup> “Text of the President’s Toast at Spanish State Luncheon,” June 25, 1980; Rome (Italy), Venice (Italy)—Economic Summit, Belgrad (Yugoslavia), Madrid (Spain), Lisbon (Portugal), 6/19/80; box 108; Staff Offices Press Granum; JCL.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*



being the home of the CSCE meeting. Both leaders hoped the Madrid conference “would permit the creation of a climate favorable to dialogue and cooperation, that it would favor the reestablishment of mutual confidence and make it possible to advance on the road toward détente and peace.”<sup>80</sup>

U.S. public diplomacy saw a resurgence during the Reagan administration. One of the issues faced by the ICA during the Reagan years was hostility toward U.S. nuclear power. Western European countries, already apprehensive of Reagan, saw the reheating of the Cold War as a problem. In a telegram to all consular posts, Secretary of State Alexander Haig made it clear that USIS posts, media reactions, and surveys showed that the United States faced an uphill battle with Western Europe. He recounted that the United States should “elevate policy persuasion and public affairs to a high priority at all European posts, particularly in NATO member countries.”<sup>81</sup> Haig highlighted five policy priorities: East-West relations, TNF, Western defense, the Middle East, and Central America. Haig argued that Europeans “clearly recognized that the U.S. has changed and that we are determined to restore our strength and to resist Soviet expansionism.”<sup>82</sup> To emphasize this change, ICA invited twenty-three journalists from fifteen NATO countries to visit the United States from April 21-27, 1981. One of these journalists was Andrés Garrigo from *La Vanguardia*. The ICA explained that some of the European journalists were “especially impressed by what they saw as strong support among the American public for government foreign policy and a popular recovery from the ‘humiliation’ of

---

<sup>80</sup> “USICA Courtesy Translation of the Spanish Government’s Statement on President Carter’s Visit,” June 26, 1980; Rome (Italy), Venice (Italy)—Economic Summit, Belgrad (Yugoslavia), Madrid (Spain), Lisbon (Portugal), 6/19/80; box 108; Staff Offices Press Granum; JCL.

<sup>81</sup> “Shaping European Attitudes,” April 17, 1981; Public Diplomacy 1981 (March 1981-June 1981); RAC 1; Dennis C. Blair Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

Vietnam.”<sup>83</sup> Garrigo believed there was “a warm and united purpose to revitalize America.”<sup>84</sup>

In 1983, the USIA—now with the returned moniker—promoted initiatives to better transatlantic relations, including Spain. Charles Z. Wick, the new head of the USIA, reported that many countries of Western Europe “remained strongly negative” about for those bases that held missiles.<sup>85</sup> But what worked in America’s favor was that Europeans preferred Reagan’s proposal for arms reduction over the Soviet Union’s proposal to limit missiles.<sup>86</sup> One method Wick used was the distribution of news through television and radio. The two major competitors for international broadcasts, VISNEWS and UPITN, agreed to broadcast news programs as well as features through “TV Satellite File.” As Wick explained, VISNEWS services 275 networks in 80 countries, which expanded the reach of the United States and saved them \$3,500 in satellite costs.<sup>87</sup> The relationship with UPI allowed the United States to become involved with broadcasts of *Nuestras Noticias*. UPI and Agencia EFE formed an all-Spanish language radio news network. The Spanish government threw full support behind *Nuestras Noticias* and cooperated with the United States to “serve the growing Hispanic-American community” in the country.<sup>88</sup> Another initiative that Wick’s USIA promoted was Project Democracy. Led by the USIA, the program launched “an aggressive worldwide effort to strengthen the political, intellectual and social infrastructures that make democracies function

---

<sup>83</sup> “NATO Defense Journalist Tour,” May 11, 1981; Public Diplomacy 1981 (March 1981-June 1981); RAC 1; Dennis C. Blair Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Cull, *USIA*, 427.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> To Judge Clark from Charles Wick, August 8, 1983; USIA (08/01/1983-12/31/1983); RAC box 10; Series I Subject, Walter Raymond Files; RRL.

<sup>88</sup> To Charles Hill from Robert Kimmitt, October 7, 1983; Spain - 1983 (October 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

worldwide.”<sup>89</sup> During a December 1982 meeting on Project Democracy, a discussion occurred as to whether to open a “center for democracy or for democratic studies” in Europe with the possible location being Spain.<sup>90</sup>

The Reagan administration used methods like previous administrations used such as promoting official state visits and economic rights. Much like the Nixon and Ford public diplomacy, the USIA under Reagan promoted trips from prominent Spanish figures. In 1981, there were visits from Suárez and Juan Carlos and Sofía, which placed more emphasis on the latter. In February 1981, after the events of 23-F, Director of Western European Affairs on the NSC James Rentschler recommended that Reagan and Bush go to a dinner in honor Suárez that was put together by Spanish ambassador José Lladó. Rentschler explained that this was a venue to “further signal our support for Spanish democracy” and would make a positive reflection on U.S.-Spain relations.<sup>91</sup> Reagan could not attend the event, but Bush did. The vice president received talking points from Rentschler that detailed 23-F, U.S.-Spanish relations, and congratulations to Suárez. In addition, the talking points pointed toward Spanish democracy by detailing how the Reagan administration “want all Spaniards to know that the preservation of their democracy not only is fully supported by the United States, but it is our number one concern in Spain.”<sup>92</sup>

In October 1981, the Reagan administration hosted Juan Carlos and Sofia in the White House. To prepare for their arrival, the administration attempted to drum up

---

<sup>89</sup> Cull, *USIA*, 421.

<sup>90</sup> From Steven Steiner, December 7, 1982; Public Diplomacy 1982 (November 1982); RAC box 4; Dennis C. Blair Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

<sup>91</sup> To Richard V. Allen from James Rentschler, February 26, 1981; Spain (02/21/1981-03/26/1981); RAC box 20; Executive Secretariat, NSC: Country File, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>92</sup> “Talking Points for Vice President Bush’s Conversation with Former Spanish Prime Minister Suárez,” March 2, 1981; folder 018865; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

interest in Spain. The magazines *ABC* and *La Vanguardia* planned to publish an interview with Reagan two days prior to the Spanish royal visit. Ambassador Todman wrote that this was an excellent opportunity for the administration to interact with the Spanish public. Todman explains that it will “contribute significantly to [the] accomplishment of most important U.S. policy objectives vis-à-vis Spain by reiterating U.S. support for consolidation of Spanish democracy.”<sup>93</sup> In the prepared question and answers, Reagan emphasized how he and Juan Carlos “share a devotion to representative democracy and the security of the West,” and how they attach “great importance to the evolution of democratic institutions in Spain.”<sup>94</sup>

Once Juan Carlos and Sofía arrived, they were feted with a White House dinner. The State Department produced a guest list for the event that included such names as Joe Biden, Tip O’Neill, Henry Kissinger, John David Lodge, Juan Linz, Mr. and Mrs. David Rockefeller, and representatives from Ford, GE, GM, Gulf Oil, IBM, Westinghouse, Boeing, and Dupont.<sup>95</sup> During the dinner, Reagan gave an address that emphasized democracy, the importance of Spain to the United States, and the history of Spain. In the research for possible themes in the speech, the administration detailed the regional differences in Spain as “a ‘balkanized’ series of semi-autonomous regions,” and argued that the arrival of *Guernica* was “proof that Spanish democracy is on the road to stability.”<sup>96</sup> However, one portion of the research was starred and worked into the speech.

This dealt with the history of El Cid, a folk hero in Spain, and comparisons to Juan

---

<sup>93</sup> To USICA from Todman, October 2, 1981; folder 043000-045999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

<sup>94</sup> “Proposed Interview with President Reagan,” folder 043000-045999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

<sup>95</sup> To Michael Deaver from Charles Tyson, September 17, 1981; folder 036000—042999; box 176; WHORM Subject File, CO 145; RRL.

<sup>96</sup> Possible Themes for Spanish Speech, John Roberts, September 23, 1981; 10/13/1981 Juan Carlos of Spain (4); box 23; Office of Speech Writing: Research Office Records; RRL.

Carlos. This included comparisons to the exile of El Cid and the king's father, Don Juan, and that both El Cid and Juan Carlos were "born in a good hour." The administration pointed to a needed illusion to El Cid and being born in a good hour to demonstrate "faith in what the King is doing as well as a good grasp of Spanish culture. The Cid is universally acclaimed in Spain, a folk hero we can cite without any drawback whatsoever."<sup>97</sup> Though the American public may have drawn a connection to El Cid through the 1961 film starring Reagan's friend, Charlton Heston.

While their previous official visit under Ford provided positive press in Spain, Juan Carlos and Sofia's trip to the Reagan White House caused a controversy in Spain. Though the intention of the state visit was to bring about support for Spanish democracy, much of the discussion between Juan Carlos and Reagan dealt with NATO, EC membership, and Spanish military. However, the White House issued a statement that Juan Carlos expressed "his personal commitment to NATO, thereby interfering with the political process."<sup>98</sup> Foreign Minister José Pedro Pérez Llorca had to put out the fire by clarifying the king was just reiterating the Spanish stance, but the Spanish press blamed the Reagan administration for its "steamroller tactics."<sup>99</sup> The Reagan administration did not assist the USIA in trying to build public diplomacy due to their diplomatic efforts in Spain. This is especially true with the Spanish public's reaction to Haig's comments on 23-F, Reagan's meddling in Central America, and American insistence on Spanish NATO entry taking away from domestic issues.

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Paul Preston, *Juan Carlos: Steering Spain from Dictatorship to Democracy* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2004), 493-4.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 494.

The next Spanish state visit would not occur until 1983 when Prime Minister González traveled to the United States. In a background briefing, a senior administration official detailed González's visit to the White House. This official expressed an overall theme of a strong bilateral relationship between the United States and Spain. The official pointed that what was remarkable about U.S.-Spanish relations was "we have sustained that relationship through the period of transition from the Franco period to democracy."<sup>100</sup> In addition, the official discussed two keys to González's visit. First, the visit was meant to show that the Reagan administration could "get along very well with a young, democratically-elected, Socialist leader" after years of Franco. Second, the visit was meant as "almost a celebration of the fact that Spain has become a fully participating, democratic country."<sup>101</sup>

When dealing with economic rights, the Reagan administration chose to focus on consumer protections. According to a USIA research memo, the Spanish public believed that economic rights rather than political rights "when government leaders talk about human rights."<sup>102</sup> Whereas the Carter administration's public diplomacy promoted labor rights and labor unions, the USIA under Reagan promoted consumer affairs. In 1983, Virginia Knauer, the Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs under Reagan, went on a speaking tour of Europe to discuss consumer protections. On October 17, 1983, Knauer gave an address in Madrid where she detailed the history of U.S. consumer protections and emphasized Reagan's outlook on consumerism and consumer protections. Though the speech was about these issues, there are a few references to the importance of

---

<sup>100</sup> "Background Briefing by Senior Administration Official on the visit of Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez of Spain," June 17, 1983; Spain; box 22; Office of Media Relations Records; RRL.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

<sup>102</sup> "Spanish Public Critical of Wide Range of US Policies," January 23, 1986; Spain-1986 (7); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

democracy in her speech. Knauer discussed three distinct characteristics of U.S. trade policies: “diversity of tastes, freedom of expression, and a desire for our improving standard of living.”<sup>103</sup> Knauer continues by emphasizing the importance of freedom of speech to democracy. She demonstrates the importance of vocal Americans demanding quality in their goods leads to an “improvement of products or services in the marketplace because sellers who don’t respond to consumer complaints will not be in business long.”<sup>104</sup> Knauer’s visit to Madrid left an impression on her, which she details in a letter to a member of the Confederacion Espanola de Organizaciones Empresariales. She disclosed how the Spanish were looking toward change and reform for consumers. Knauer detailed “the sense of purpose I found in all segments of Spanish society ... [was] to improve the protections of Spanish consumers by legislation or updated regulations.”<sup>105</sup>

The United States had a lively program at the USIS posts in Spain during the Reagan administration. For two years, the United States built a state-of-the-art cultural center in downtown Madrid, around the corner from Parliament. McKinney Russell, a USIA worker at the Madrid embassy, revealed that the cultural center was “a major source of information about legislation, about legislative procedures, about judicial activities in this country.”<sup>106</sup> Coupled with the expansion of the USIA at home, cultural offices in Spain expanded as well with offices in Barcelona, Seville, and Bilbao. Russell explains that the Madrid office believed it was important to increase the number of

---

<sup>103</sup> Virginia Knauer’s Personal Reading Copy, October 17, 1983; 10/17/1983-Madrid, Spain-USIA-Ministry Auditorium (Spanish Officials, Consumer Leaders); box 116; Virginia H. Knauer Files; Office of Consumer Affairs; RRL.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> To Rafael Sarandeses Arias from Virginia Knauer, November 16, 1983; Spain (2), box 64; Virginia H. Knauer Files; Office of Consumer Affairs; RRL.

<sup>106</sup> Interview with McKinney Russell, May 10, 1997, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

International Visitors program as the expansion in Spain continued. The argument was that the exchange program was vital as they underwent the critical years of transitioning to democracy. Russell argues that the exchanges during the early 1980s “was one of the really important contributory elements to the anchoring of democracy in Spain.”<sup>107</sup>

Visual arts played an indispensable role in the USIS posts in Spain. Another USIA initiative that affected Spain was the development of WORLDNET. This was a program to use satellite television to broadcast programs for the USIA. Thomas R. Carmichael, a member of the USIA press section of the Madrid Embassy, explains that he would take talking points “to the speakers in Washington for the program, and made sure they knew what media people were going to be in the audience.”<sup>108</sup> In addition, the exchanging of exhibitions and participation in expositions produced exchanges between the USIA and Spain. Some of these were paid for by the money from the base agreement. For example, the Guggenheim Museum in New York received a Joan Miró exhibition, the Spanish National Ballet toured the United States, and American artists could travel around Spain and participate in an artist in residence program.<sup>109</sup> Further, Spain expressed interest in participating in the Louisiana World Exposition in 1984. The fair’s value was discussed in a meeting between Juan Carlos and Reagan. The Louisiana World Exposition could provide “a projection of Spanish cultural presence, as a tourist market developer, and as a means of promoting its products.”<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Interview with Thomas R. Carmichael, January 25, 2010, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>109</sup> Interview with Edward C. McBride, February 9, 2001, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>110</sup> “Meeting of King Juan Carlos with the President, December 8,” November 25, 1983; Spain - 1983 (November 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.



Recalling the central thesis of the presidential speeches, the United States would not exist without the Spanish discovery of the Americas. The public diplomacy initiatives of the USIA illustrate that the United States wanted to return the favor by counselling Spain through the transition to democracy. However, the hard power decisions of Washington made it difficult to persuade the Spanish public of this intention. To counter this, the United States needed to utilize soft power. The USIA became the government organization tasked with developing this soft power and do so through public diplomacy. The goal of the USIA during the transition was to make the United States appealing and promote democracy. The organization had to configure a different strategy for each presidential administration. For Nixon, the USIA promoted the success of the Apollo program and scientific education in Spain. Under Ford, the U.S. Bicentennial played a key role in promoting Juan Carlos as the King of Spanish democracy. The USIA underwent changes with Carter and struggled to find a cohesive definition to promote human rights. Yet, the administration utilized the promotion of labor unions to promote economic rights. The Reagan years saw a similar approach with protection of consumer rights.

While the administrations utilized different approaches, they each faced common resistance—the Spanish people. The USIA had to fight an uphill battle as the Spanish public as they were hostile in their views of Americans. Spanish citizens blamed the United States for propping up Franco, taking advantage of Spanish military and economic weakness to take military bases, imperialistic policies in Latin America, and causing a bipolar world through their naked aggression during the Cold War. The goal of the USIA in Spain, despite different approaches of each administration, was to singularly connect

Spain with the United States. As the democratic bastions of the Cold War, the United States believed this was how they could connect with Spain—a growing and emerging democracy on the world’s stage. Yet, the public diplomacy efforts of the USIA made little progress in Spain. To build soft power, the United States would need to rely on the assistance of NGOs.

## CHAPTER 4

### No Dead Languages, Only Dormant Minds: Education and Soft Power

John Brademas, the President of New York University (NYU), approached a lectern in Elmer Holmes Bobst Library on a cold December 7, 1983. Through the funding of Milton Petrie, Brademas dedicated a professorship in honor of the Spanish king—the King Juan Carlos I Chair in Spanish Culture and Civilization. Juan Carlos and Queen Sofía were in attendance alongside the Spanish Minister of Education José María Maravall and the Spanish Minister of Culture Javier Solana. Brademas discussed the importance and expansion of Spanish studies at NYU during the last few years as well as the establishment of Catalan Studies in collaboration with the University of Barcelona. The prior month Brademas visited Spain to accept a fellowship named in honor of Andres Segovia, which sent students to NYU for the study of Spanish culture and the instrumentation of the classical guitar. Next, Juan Carlos spoke of how NYU’s emphasis on Spanish culture would continue to promote “the values which we should work for most in the world today: togetherness, affection, and respect among different cultures.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “NYU Chair to Honor King of Spain,” *New York Times*, December 7, 1983.

Brademas gifted Juan Carlos with a 1522 map of the New World as a symbol of the “ties of history and culture that unite our two countries.”<sup>2</sup> While the two men spoke of the interconnectivity between the United States and Spain, they failed to mention the most common pathway for culture to transfer: educational exchanges.

Brademas’s speech highlighted the significance of education in the history of U.S.-Spain relations, particularly the involvement of Juan Carlos. In his concluding remarks, Brademas applauded the role of Juan Carlos during the transition to democracy and as a leader of U.S.-Spain relations:

But there is yet one final reason we wish today to honor his majesty and it is to express to him the admiration and respect of the American people for the wise and courageous leadership he has given to his people as Spain plays a more important and visible part in the family of free and democratic nations. It requires no elaboration here to say that at a critical movement in the life of New Spain, it was the brave and farsighted stance of His Majesty, King Juan Carlos I, that protected the institutions of the New Spanish Democracy.<sup>3</sup>

While this makes obvious nods to 23-F and the importance of Juan Carlos as a steady figure of the turbulent political changes, Brademas is also mentioning the importance of the Spanish royal in supporting education in Spain. The NYU president lauded Juan Carlos for his ability to speak “eloquently of the indispensable role of education and culture in building a world of peace and freedom.”<sup>4</sup> The Franco regime did little for education, but by the 1970s a reform law and the transition to democracy sparked a revolution in education and educational exchanges.

Education gave a chance for the United States to build soft power in Spain during both the Franco regime and the ensuing democratic governments. As Nye described,

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> “Remarks of Dr. John Brademas at the Convocation Marking the Creation of the King Juan Carlos I Chair in Spanish Studies and Civilization,” December 7, 1983; Welcome Remarks Honor Juan Carlos 12/6/83; box 616; Series I, Speeches in the Records of the Office of the President; NYUL.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

academic exchanges “played a significant role in enhancing American soft power.”<sup>5</sup> This included educational exchanges developed and implemented by both a governmental organization and a nongovernmental organization. The Fulbright program supported hundreds of American and Spanish students as they studied abroad and returned home. The United States believed the American and Spanish students would discuss their experience with their fellow citizens and take their respective ideals abroad. The Ford Foundation (FF) played just as vital a role in the development of soft power in Spain as well. The NGO subsidized educational exchanges, but the importance of the FF dealt with the development of the 1970 General Law of Education. This reform effort provided Spain with an American style education system to help the “successor generation” with easier access to education. The reform law “is a Spanish-oriented copy of the U.S. educational system,” so much so that critics “state that it is too close a copy and not based enough on Spanish heritage.”<sup>6</sup>

Though both Fulbright and the FF assisted in the Spanish educational reform, both organizations had distinctive goals in Spain. In the late 1960s, the FF recognized the importance of Spain and believed if the education system underwent transformation, the Western nations would open to Spain. By the 1980s, the FF approved projects for conferences and books that examined Spain’s role in the world, security options, and issues of self-determination. Simultaneously, the Fulbright program stressed a few educational initiatives in Spain. This included initially focusing on English teaching, educational development, business, and a variety of sciences. The belief that a constant exchange of students would help the reform and development of the new Spanish

---

<sup>5</sup> Nye, *Soft Power*, 45.

<sup>6</sup> “Annual Report for Spain for Fiscal Year July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970,” September 23, 1970; Spain, 1958-1970; box 320; Post Reports, CU; UAL.

education system. This included sending American professors to Spain, receiving Spanish educators in the United States, and Spain hosting several postdoctoral fellows and junior lecturers.

### **Spanish Education Prior to 1970**

Education in Spain during the Franco dictatorship was not ideal. The regime used education as a propaganda tool to indoctrinate Spanish youths. However, as the 1960s approached, the regime “appeared indifferent” to the state of education and placed it in the hands of the Catholic Church.<sup>7</sup> Despite the inattentiveness, the FF believed expansion of education would help Spain on the international stage. During the late 1960s, the FF began noticing the backwardness of Spain in three academic areas—social sciences, business, and the arts. Ruben E. Reina, Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, worked with the FF to create a triangular exchange of cultural anthropology students between the United States, Spain, and South America. Reina used travel funds from the FF to observe Spain, Argentina, Bogota, and Guatemala. In his work in these areas, Reina noticed the few anthropologists in Spain received their training abroad, and the *catedrático* (professor) in Spain was quite uniformed in the social sciences. He argued this lack of emphasis on social sciences made Spain “culturally very different” from Latin America, and the Spanish students “cannot be handled with the same policies and techniques.”<sup>8</sup>

Another FF approved study in the late 1960s examined Spain’s need for business education. Spain was at the tail end of the “Spanish Miracle,” an economic boom that

---

<sup>7</sup> Tamar Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy in Spain, 1970-1985* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 9.

<sup>8</sup> Ruben E. Reina to Harry Wilhelm, October 11, 1967; Report 001922; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

began in the 1950s and lasted until Franco's death. This led to rapid industrialization that allowed Spain to recover economically. William C. Fredrick and Chadwick J. Haberstroh received funding to research management education in Spain. Frederick and Haberstroh described prior business schools in Spain focused on lower-level commercial training, but a recent impetus focused on formal management education. The authors noted similarities and differences between Spain and the United States, but these should not be the only criteria for gauging the success of the programs. Instead, a "more important test of adequacy of Spanish management education institutions is whether they are workable for Spaniards, in Spain."<sup>9</sup> Frederick and Haberstroh applauded the emerging management education movement in the face of mistrust and hostility toward upper professional management in Spanish society and the educational system. They argued the Spanish education system was elitist and restricted, and that Spanish professors belong to "a tradition of privilege, part-time teaching, non-research, and rigid authoritarianism;" and that Spanish students cannot give the requisite study devotion due to Spain's "inflexibility ministerial and academic bureaucracy that discourages educational reform."<sup>10</sup> Fredrick and Haberstroh point to the backwardness of the Spanish educational system through management education.

Another example of an FF study in Spain was the International Survey on the Promotion of the Arts with reports written by Ruby D'Arschot. These four reports on Spain focus on the role of music, theater, plastic arts, and cinematography. D'Arschot argued that the regionalism in Spain is best seen in music, and it would be a "serious

---

<sup>9</sup> "Management Education in Spain," William C. Fredrick and Chadwick J. Haberstroh, 1968; Report 005180; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

mistake to limit one's idea of Spanish cultural life to that of Madrid."<sup>11</sup> Yet, the Spanish government found methods of hurting other arts in Spain due to censorship. D'Arshot explained that this, coupled with a lack of professionalism, caused theater to struggle throughout Spain. But the Spanish government funded the school of cinematography to "stimulate technical and artistic progress" among films in Spain.<sup>12</sup> Though they received little support from the Franco regime, D'Arshot argued four Schools of Fine Arts fostered a renaissance in the plastic arts—art forms that are molded such as sculptures or ceramics.

The FF studies underscored the poor conditions of the educational system in Spain under Franco. Issues such as funding, professionalism, elitism, and meddling from the regime illustrate the inadequacies of education in Spain prior to the 1970s. The disparity is especially shocking since the subjects of social sciences, business, and art were aspects covered under the nonmilitary aspects (NMAs) of the base agreements. Another shock is that Spain—a country that prided itself on cultural heritage and the greatness of its artists—received such a negative review on art education from D'Arshot. The Ford Foundation played a critical role in exposing the weaknesses of education in Francoist Spain.

Yet, the decisionmakers of the Fulbright program—in conjunction with the FF—believed the current dire straits of education in Spain offered an opportunity to promote and expand American Studies. The origins of American Studies programs in Spain are traced to the FF. In December 1960, the foundation announced a \$2.5 million grant over

---

<sup>11</sup> "The Situation of Music in Spain," Ruby D'Arshot, August 22, 1969; Report 019964; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>12</sup> "The Official School of Cinematography," Ruby D'Arshot, 1969; Report 019963; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.



five years for programs in European universities.<sup>13</sup> By the 1970s, the FF began cutting funding to support other projects. As Harold Howe II wrote, the FF limited the financing to Spain during the education reform due to financial, substantive, and program priorities.<sup>14</sup> Once the FF began losing interest in American Studies in Spain, the Fulbright Program stepped in. This included sending junior lecturers in American Studies to teach courses on the United States and working with the Institute of North American Studies in Barcelona.<sup>15</sup> The USIA also provided support for American Studies, especially around the time of the Bicentennial.

Using American Studies as a window into Spain, the Fulbright Program focused on the teaching of English to build goodwill for the United States. American Studies programs by the late 1960s began to stagnate in Western Europe and there were questions over the funding of the exchanges. However, American Studies maintained its progress in Spain. One reason for this was that the nonmilitary agreements in the early 1970s provided the funds for educational exchanges, and Spain also increased financial contributions.<sup>16</sup> The program's basic objective in 1969 was to stimulate English teaching, American Studies and the social sciences as well as to continue "constructive evolution on the political and economic side."<sup>17</sup> Fulbright worked with the FF as the latter began to cut funding for teaching English in Spain. During the 1969-70 school year, Fulbright and

---

<sup>13</sup> Giles Scott-Smith, "Laying the Foundations: U.S. Public Diplomacy and the Promotion of American Studies in Europe," in *Teaching and Studying U.S. History in Europe*, 57.

<sup>14</sup> Harold Howe II to Peter Fraenkel, March 22, 1971; Spain-General-Memoranda re: fellowships, university development, trip 1968-1971; box 161; Peter E. de Janosi, Program Staff Files, 1954-1975, Higher Education and Research Division, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>15</sup> "Monthly Highlights: March 1971," April 16, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA. "Monthly Highlights: October 1971," November 8, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>16</sup> Francisco Javier Rodríguez Jiménez, "Culture and National Images: American Studies vs. Anti-Americanism in Spain" in *US Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain*, 123.

<sup>17</sup> "Annual report for Spain for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968-June 30, 1969," August 16, 1969; Spain, 1958-1970; box 320; Post Reports, CU; UAL.

FF co-sponsored three English teacher seminars. Fulbright continued their work on English teaching after the Spanish educational reform. However, by the 1971-1972 school year, the importance of English as a Foreign Language transitioned to an emphasis of American Studies. Spanish universities became more interested in hosting lecturers whose backgrounds were in American Studies. Specifically, Spain wanted scholars who focused on American literature who had been used for teaching English as a second language.

As the FF pointed to issues with the Spanish educational system, the Fulbright program concerned itself with promoting the goals of U.S. soft power. The FF knew of the deficiencies in Spanish education and believed they could help Spain in the 1960s. During this time, the FF provided funding for American Studies programs. However, the research provided by those funded by the FF made it obvious they must consider funding education overall not just one subject. Meanwhile, the Fulbright program hoped to continue their success of American Studies in Spain by continuing the program. Fulbright took advantage of the now empty sphere of influence for American Studies with the FF cutting resources in Spain to reassign the funding to other priorities. American Studies was a way for the United States to gain the “hearts and minds” of the Spanish public. Even when the programs failed to gain attendance, the Fulbright program continued moving forward by merging English as a Foreign Language into American Studies. This is illustrative of an NGO providing evidence to a problem, but the GO continuing the march forward with their own soft power goals.

### **The 1970 General Law of Education**

While the FF and Fulbright program had distinct goals in Spain, both organizations played roles in the creation and implementation of the 1970 General Law of Education (Ley General de Educación) in Spain. This was the most ambitious reform during the Franco regime and the first major education reform since 1857.<sup>18</sup> Reforms began following the February 1969 publication of *Libro Blanco* (White Book). It provided an examination of the education system and pointed to several problems. These included: “an obsolete education system which could not serve the needs of modern society; the existence of a gap between the contents of the different stages of education; high failure rates; exams being the only means of evaluating students; a direct link between students’ socio-economic circumstances and the level of education they achieved; and the existence of two parallel education systems—one private, which provided education to the upper classes, and one public, which accommodated the lower classes.”<sup>19</sup> The General Law of Education followed the *Libro Blanco* in August 1970 and sought to normalize education in Spain from elementary schools through graduate school.

The Fulbright program supported the development of the reform and modeling the Spanish education system after the United States. Members of the Nixon administration stressed their support of the reform in Spain. They argued it was an exceptional opportunity to identify the United States with the most “dynamic liberal and constructive initiative yet taken” by the Franco regime, and active U.S. participation in educational reform would “associate the U.S. with those Spaniards who offer positive hope for post-Franco period.”<sup>20</sup> Spain asked for U.S. assistance as well. Spanish Foreign Minister

---

<sup>18</sup> Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy*, 9.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> “Spanish Base Negotiations in Larger Context,” April 9, 1969; Spain vol 1 through Feb. 1970 (1); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

López-Bravo spoke with a U.S. official about sending “a team of experts to Madrid to look at education and scientific projects” as well as train U.S. and Spanish professors.<sup>21</sup> As Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla explains, the United States gained Spanish public support for their championing of education reform. They gained this through directly or indirectly helping in major foreign support and “providing financing, training, experts, and material for its application.”<sup>22</sup>

Ultimately, the United States tried to attach support for the General Law of Education through the 1970 base agreement. The bilateral agreement provided around \$3 million to invest in science and education. The funding from the agreement could influence the education reform by establishing new institutions for training science teachers. Specifically, Nixon knew this could benefit “both the educational system and the future technical base of Spanish science and technology.”<sup>23</sup> The administration believed close cooperation on atomic energy could help the rapidly industrializing Spain as well as maintenance for the current U.S. power reactor, the two under construction, and the six planned.<sup>24</sup> Again, the United States placed defensive interests into the forefront using the Spanish reforms and transition as ways to help themselves. Further, the United States mediated between their own governmental organizations and other international organizations such as the World Bank, UNESCO, and the FF. As Tamar

---

<sup>21</sup> “U.S.-Spanish Base Negotiations,” April 16, 1970; Spain vol 2 Mar 1970-Jul 1970; box 705; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>22</sup> Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, “Estados Unidos, ¿soporte del franquismo o germen de la democracia?,” 296-7.

<sup>23</sup> Briefing Book for Madrid Visit, October 2, 1970; Visit of Richard Nixon Briefing Book Spain; box 468; President’s Trip Files, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

Groves and Mariano González Delgado explain, international actors like UNESCO assisted in importing U.S. experimental pedagogy to Spain.<sup>25</sup>

While the United States government supported the educational reforms through the NMAs of the base agreements, the FF provided a representative to help in the drafting and implementation of the reforms. The role of Peter Fraenkel in the General Law of Education cannot be underestimated in its importance to the transition to democracy. Fraenkel helped Spain integrate a new educational system just as the country began transitioning from authoritarianism to constitutional monarchy. He was also a natural choice for the FF because of his history of observing education in Spain. Fraenkel visited the country in 1968 for a month to witness the Spanish educational system in Madrid, Barcelona, San Sebastian, Pamplona, and Bilbao. One major problem Fraenkel witnessed was the access to education. He explained that for secondary education only 24 percent of men and 18 percent of women were enrolled, and in higher education the percentage was 5 percent of men and 1 percent of women.<sup>26</sup> Fraenkel used a specific example of Bilbao—what he referred to as the “Pittsburgh of Spain”—which only had two public high schools with enrollments of approximately 3,000 each for a city of roughly 370,000 and more than 500,000 in the greater metropolitan area.<sup>27</sup> One purpose of his journey to Spain was to speak for the FF’s events in Spain and discover possible partnerships between schools and universities with the Foundation. Some of the suggestions included collaboration in planning new universities, fellowship programs for young Spaniards,

---

<sup>25</sup> Tamar Groves and Mariano González Delgado, “Chocando contra la cultura escolar: Las paradojas de la importación pedagógica en la España del desarrollismo,” in *El factor internacional en la modernización educativa, científica y militar de España* eds. Lorenzo Delgado Gómez Escalonilla, Pablo León Aguinaga, Oscar J. Martín García, and Esther M. Sánchez Sánchez (Alicante : Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2017): 129-151.

<sup>26</sup> “Spain Trip Report, October 23-November 19, 1968,” Peter Fraenkel; Report 004574; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

short-term study abroad funds, and a special program for applied social sciences.

Fraenkel was adamant that the FF work in Spain. He wrote in a report:

Spain is at the end of an era. This era began thirty years ago. No one knows how long the end of the old era may last—nor what the nature of the new era will be when it begins. But the period of transition from the old era into the new one is underway. Thus, the present is for Spain a time of introspection and analysis, of planning and preparation for the future. It is a most uncertain time for all Spaniards—but it is a time also of restlessness and great expectations, particularly for youth. It is an unusually propitious time for the Foundation to systematically study Spain — and perhaps also cautiously to begin to expand our hitherto so modest investments in that country.<sup>28</sup>

Fraenkel concluded that though Spain was about to undergo a difficult transition, the FF should be as involved in the country as much as possible.

Fraenkel continued to monitor the educational reform in Spain and work as a liaison with the Foundation. He detailed how the reform was set forth in the *Libro Blanco*. Yet, Fraenkel worried that Spain may end up pushing a full reform effort without assistance from anyone including the United States. Fraenkel met with members of the State Department who voiced concern that “they can see no way of special U.S. Government assistance to Spanish education except by tying such assistance in some way as a form of ‘payment’ for the right to use the bases.”<sup>29</sup> There was some discussion of sending appropriations of the Fulbright program in Spain to the reform effort. Under Secretary for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson stressed that the money Spain hoped for “was not available” at the magnitude proposed.<sup>30</sup> Fraenkel stressed the importance of the FF helping Spain in the reform effort through staff advancement and three other specific

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Peter Fraenkel to Marshall Robinson and Howard Swearer, September 30, 1969; Spain-General-Memoranda re: fellowships, university development, trip 1968-1971; box 16; Higher Education and Research Division, Program Staff Files, 1954-1975, Peter E. de Janosi; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>30</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, March 25, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (2); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

developments. He proposed a collaboration with the Institutes of Educational Science, a FF collaboration with the Faculty of Economics at the new Autonomous University of Madrid, or providing the service of Professor Severo Ochoa, a Spanish physician and co-winner of the 1959 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine.<sup>31</sup> Yet, Fraenkel did highlight the risks of the FF working in Spain. He described Spanish society, particularly the private sector, as divided sharply over those who supported and those who opposed the reform. As Tamar Groves and Cecilia Milito Barone explain, this pattern is representative of Spanish social divisions over modernizing the nation itself. Those who supported the reform believed the “democratic education” would legitimize Spain on a national and international stage, but those who opposed said the reform’s “egalitarian tone” believed it would destabilize the regime.<sup>32</sup>

The Spanish Ministry of Education stressed with urgency the creation of an Institute of Educational Sciences in all universities. Education Minister José Luis Villar Palasí wrote to Fraenkel that these institutes would improve teaching methods and “meet the needs of training teachers and readapting them to the present requirements.”<sup>33</sup> Further, they would carry out the necessary research to promote continuous modernization in teaching methods. Fraenkel worked with Lawrence A. Cremin, a professor at the Teachers College Columbia University, to identify nine American

---

<sup>31</sup> Fraenkel to F. Champion Ward, November 10, 1969; Program of Support to Educational Modernization and Reform in Spain, General Correspondence, 1969-1970; box 6; International Division, Latin America and the Caribbean, Office Files of Peter A. Fraenkel; Series II: Educational Modernization Grant, Madrid Field Office Files; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>32</sup> Tamar Groves and Cecilia Milito Barone, “Imagining a Democratic Future, Forgetting a Worrisome Past: Educational Policy, School Textbooks, and Teachers under the Franco Regime” in *War & Society* 33, no. 1 (Feb. 2014), 53.

<sup>33</sup> Villar Palasí to Fraenkel, January 27, 1970; Program of Support to Educational Modernization and Reform in Spain, General Correspondence, 1969-1970; box 6; International Division, Latin America and the Caribbean, Office Files of Peter A. Fraenkel; Series II: Educational Modernization Grant, Madrid Field Office Files; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

universities to send Spaniards to learn educational theory and practice. These included Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, Cornell, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, Cal-Berkley, and Princeton.<sup>34</sup> In April 1970, the FF approved a \$400,000 grant for the Institute of International Education and support of educational modernization and reform in Spain. A large portion of this funding was used in support of fellowships for Spanish educators to study abroad, but other funding included a small number of short-term consultants for specific assignments in Spain.<sup>35</sup>

The 1970 General Law of Education represented a massive step toward the *apertura*. The law and the Basic General Education sought to provide equal opportunities for elementary education. Further, the coordination of curriculum, providing teachers with new pedagogy, and the formation of teacher working groups showed that Spain was, for the first time under Franco, forward-looking instead of backward. Spanish teachers “had a great deal of freedom to choose their teaching techniques.”<sup>36</sup> The U.S. had an opportunity to help shepherd in a modernized Spain to the world. While the FF did so with Fraenkel, the U.S. government instead chose to focus on helping themselves defensively. Fraenkel worked with educators and government official to build ties and prepare educational exchanges for Spanish teachers. Yet, the Nixon administration chose to attach U.S. funding to these exchanges if Spain signed the bases agreement.

---

<sup>34</sup> Philip H. Phenix to Fraenkel, March 14, 1970; Program of Support to Educational Modernization and Reform in Spain, General Correspondence, 1969-1970; box 6; International Division, Latin America and the Caribbean, Office Files of Peter A. Fraenkel; Series II: Educational Modernization Grant, Madrid Field Office Files; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>35</sup> “Ford Foundation Collaboration with the Educational Reform in Spain,” September 25, 1970; Program of Support to Educational Modernization and Reform in Spain, General Correspondence, 1969-1970; box 6; International Division, Latin America and the Caribbean, Office Files of Peter A. Fraenkel; Series II: Educational Modernization Grant, Madrid Field Office Files; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>36</sup> Groves, *Teachers and the Struggle*, 10.



## The Ford Foundation After 1970

Over the next four years, Fraenkel sporadically returned to Spain to evaluate the progress of educational reform efforts. Some of the achievements that Fraenkel highlighted in 1971 include the decentralization of the public-school system, citizen participation in education, and institute the new Basic General Education.<sup>37</sup> Yet, he pointed to immediate and practical problems with the reform that included teacher assignments and financing. The Spanish Civil Service consisted of distinctive Cuerpos, which Fraenkel explains is “a Spanish word having many of the connotations of the English ‘corps.’”<sup>38</sup> To teach the new Basic General Education grades, the Spanish Civil Service created a new Cuerpo. Members of the older education Cuerpos demanded automatic membership to the new group. Debates over who would teach the upper four grades of the new eight-year schools and over qualifications for teaching certain subjects slowed progress of the reform efforts. So did labor unrest. Since strikes were still illegal in Spain, teachers had sporadic “absences” and “stoppages” along with public protests and slowdowns during the winter and spring of 1970 and 1971.<sup>39</sup> The factors that triggered these strikes dealt with who qualified to teach which grades and delays in their salaries.<sup>40</sup> The Ministry of Education’s extraordinary difficulties in obtaining financing and disbursing funds further slowed reforms. Fraenkel defended the leaders of the reform by saying the system they were working within was “a labyrinthic maze of procedures in support of procedures, controls upon controls, and approvals of approvals.”<sup>41</sup> While the

---

<sup>37</sup> “Comments on the Current Status of the Spanish Educational Reform – Major Achievements, Problems, and Prospects,” Peter Fraenkel, July 29, 1971; Report 007993; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.; Groves, *Teachers*, 23.

<sup>41</sup> “Comments on the Current Status.”

reform law represented a push towards *aperturismo*, the Franco regime did not try to support it.

Other problems that Fraenkel highlighted in 1971 included a reshuffling of the Ministry of Education, infighting on educational plans, and poor classrooms and textbooks. Fraenkel continued to monitor the educational reform efforts in Spain, and the Ministry of Education continued to request his presence. In 1972, Fraenkel hosted a visiting professor of economic history, Craufurd Goodwin, who witnessed the evolving education scene of Spain. They visited a few universities, including the Autonomous University of Madrid. However, the visit to the Madrid campus was poorly timed as violence broke out the day of their visit. The Guardia Civil arrested the student government leader, and students protested by breaking windows on campus.<sup>42</sup> Despite the campus protest, Goodwin applauded the social scientists at the university. Goodwin explained they received information “about the complexities of policy-oriented research when the problems under examination (e.g. our favorites of ethnic tensions, migration, and regional government).”<sup>43</sup>

In June 1974, the FF gave the Indiana University Foundation \$149,000 for Fraenkel to leave his position at the university to become a consultant for the Ministry in hopes of improving education funding in Spain. One of the major difficulties was how to spend the NMAs from the 1970 Agreement. Upon returning to Spain, Frankel oversaw the selection and training of staff as well as developed a strategy for the NMA aspects of the agreement. The Ministry of Education received only \$3 million of the possible \$9 million available from the agreement. At the end of his time there, Fraenkel reported the

---

<sup>42</sup> Craufurd Goodwin to David Bell, May 24, 1972; Report 009025; Catalogued Reports, Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

“serious dissatisfaction” from the Ministry of Education, USIS posts, and others over how the money had been spent.<sup>44</sup> Fraenkel pointed to complaints regarding “lack of publicity, alleged personal favoritism, the absence of coordination between the [NMA] program and the objectives of the Ministry, and in general concerning alleged ineffectiveness and inefficiency of organization and management.”<sup>45</sup> While the tumult occurred in implementing the funds, chaos occurred outside. Fraenkel explained the Minister became “absorbed by attempting to maintain ‘law and order’ and the physical safety of teachers and students” as calls for better implementation of reform grew.<sup>46</sup> Despite the chaos surrounding his time there, Fraenkel worked out a program with the minister. The groundwork included a national training program for young university teaching personnel in business administration. Those selected from Spanish Faculties of Economics, of Law, and of Political Science were chosen to be sent to the United States to learn methods and return to Spain to implement them.

Fraenkel returned to Spain in 1976 as the Spanish transition began in earnest. He visited Madrid, Barcelona, Salamanca, and Sevilla to discuss the FF’s new funding program, the Southern European Fellowship program. During his trip, Fraenkel met with several social scientists who welcomed the new fellowship “with enthusiasm and with genuine interest wherever [he] presented it,” despite the cloud of uncertainty at the time.

<sup>47</sup> While meeting with the various departments in Spain, Fraenkel pointed to three facts that affected the number of Spanish candidates. First, the new Treaty of Friendship

---

<sup>44</sup> Providing Services of Consultant to Spanish Ministry of Education, July 11, 1974; Reel 2467, 74-447; Grants H-K; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> “Report on a Trip to Spain and Portugal, October 25-November 14, 1976,” December 3 1976; Report 005640; Ford Foundation Reports; RAC.

signed between the United States and Spain offered \$7 million for five years for educational, cultural, and scientific exchanges. Second, the politics and uncertainty of the political future of Spain deterred some applicants. Fraenkel explained that it was “difficult to forecast the effect, encouraging or discouraging” on the interest and readiness of an applicant to leave Spain for six months to a year.<sup>48</sup> Finally, Spain announced a sharp increase in the number of *oposiciones* that summer, which are exams a person must pass to become a Spanish public worker such as a public school teacher, police officer, etc.<sup>49</sup> This meant that those who were non-tenured and interested in joining the workforce could not abruptly leave Spain for a short period.

In the 1980s, the FF became interested in funding conferences and academic writings on the Spanish transition to democracy and the importance of Spain to the world. Freedom House, an NGO that advocates democracy, received a grant to hold a conference in Madrid on “Freedom, Dissent and the Western Alliance.” The conference explored the future of the Helsinki Accords and discussed the emerging dissent figures.<sup>50</sup> In addition, the Instituto de Cuestiones Internacionales (INCI) received two separate grants. The first was partial support for a conference on Spanish security options, and the second was a matching grant for possible work on Spain’s defensive relationship with Latin America. The FF staff wrote that the INCI tried to do in a short time what was never done under the Franco regime: “to establish a center of independent discussion on Spain’s foreign policy, international relations, and security problems.”<sup>51</sup> In 1983,

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> You can be a public school teacher without passing *oposiciones*, but you would only be temporary.

<sup>50</sup> Freedom House support for “Freedom, Dissent, and the Western Alliance,” December 2, 1980; 815-0096; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>51</sup> Matching Grant for General Support, Instituto de Cuestiones Internacionales, March 5, 1982; Reel 3704, 81-877; Grants H-K; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

Georgetown University received funding for partial support of a symposium on political security in Spain, which discussed Spain's integration into the European Community, NATO, and diplomacy with Central America.<sup>52</sup> In 1986, Procedural Aspects of International Law Institute received support for a research project on autonomy, sovereignty, and self-determination. The project, which turned into an 850-page manuscript, used Spain as a representation of a Western developed country and the Basque country as a case study for separatist movements.<sup>53</sup>

The FF role in Spain after the 1970 General Education Law is slight, but one cannot discount the importance the NGO played. Fraenkel's role in the development and implementation of the reform provides a transitional dimension to the Spanish domestic reform. The 1970 law established an egalitarian approach to education, something that did not exist under the Franco dictatorship. Even after the early problems of implementation, Fraenkel and the FF remained interested in Spanish educational development. This continued into the 1980s when Spain and the transition became a major topic on the global stage. The transition to democracy Western security played an integral role in academic research and the FF willingly funded these ventures.

### **Fulbright After 1970**

Though the FF remained interested in the implementation of the General Law of Education, the Fulbright program continued to push the initiatives to develop U.S. soft power. After the General Education Law passed, American Studies programs began adding more faculty members through exchanges. In 1971-1972, Spanish and American

---

<sup>52</sup> Georgetown University Partial Support for "Spain: Studies in Political Security," November 30, 1983; Reel 4698; 835-1026; Grants E-G; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

<sup>53</sup> Procedural Aspects of International Law Institute support, February 7, 1986; Reel 5697, 86-173; Grants Them-Tw; Ford Foundation Records; RAC.

universities increasingly showed interest in exchanging faculty members. The University of Seville and the University of North Carolina signed an agreement, and the Autonomous University of Madrid began negotiations with Indiana University and the University of Wisconsin for exchanges.<sup>54</sup> Several Spanish universities across the various regions of the country established Chairs in American Studies. By 1976, the largest parts of appropriations and considerable amounts of time went to developing chairs in American Studies. The University of Salamanca established an Anglo-American Studies Association, and the University of Seville hosted an International Conference on American Civilization in collaboration with the American Studies Association of the United States.<sup>55</sup> Due to the growing popularity of these programs, Fulbright began to reevaluate whether to house American Studies in English departments or make them stand-alone departments.

The General Law of Education prompted a change in the Fulbright program. Instead of focusing on teaching English, the emphasis would be placed on educational development to fit the projected need of compulsory education. This included sending U.S. professors who could “prepare teachers at the primary, secondary, and university levels” in fields like mathematics, physics, economics, sociology, and public administration.<sup>56</sup> Fulbright simultaneously outlined an objective to prepare Spanish specialists in the United States and send a bilingual American specialist to aid the Spanish Institutes of Educational Sciences. By 1975, Fulbright reported that former

---

<sup>54</sup> “Annual Report Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain, Program Year 1971,” October 15, 1972; Annual Reports, 1971-74; box 431; Spain, Western Europe, Council for International Exchange of Scholars Records (hereby referred to as CIES); UAL.

<sup>55</sup> “Evaluation of Department Programs,” June 3, 1976; CU/WE FY 1976 Evaluation Reports, Unclassified; box 26; CU Activity Reports; CU Organization and Administration; CU; UAL.

<sup>56</sup> “Annual Report Commission for educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain Program Year 1972,” October 15, 1973; Annual Reports, 1971-74; box 431; Spain, Western Europe, CIES; UAL.

Spanish grantees returned to Spain to establish themselves successfully within the academic community.<sup>57</sup> The program began focusing on applied sciences concurrently with educational development. This dealt with support of technological progress in Spain, specifically urbanization and construction, infrastructure, agriculture, and forestry.<sup>58</sup> The reason for the new stress on applied sciences dealt with an increase of Spanish students into technical schools of engineering because of educational reform. The United States believed that emphasizing applied sciences was to increase knowledge in Spain on American science and send Spanish students to the United States “who will eventually return to Spain as U.S. trained specialists to teach and continue their research at Spanish universities.”<sup>59</sup>

Another method Fulbright used during the 1970s was sending Short-Term American Grantees (STAG) and American Specialists (AMSPEC) for thematic programs. The STAGs and AMSPECs voyaged abroad to examine and instruct on specific subjects chosen that year by USIS posts. For example, in 1975, USIS Madrid requested an AMSPEC in university management to visit for a co-sponsored event with the Ministry of Education’s Institute for Educational Research (INCIE). The ten-day seminar workshopped new practices of university management.<sup>60</sup> Another instance in 1975 dealt with USIS Madrid plans to hold a program on security issues of détente and East-West

---

<sup>57</sup> “Annual Program Proposal of the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain,” 1974; Spain, 1972-1984; box 123; Program Proposals, Binational Foundations and Commissions, Fulbright Program, CU; UAL.

<sup>58</sup> “Annual Program Proposal of the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain,” 1973; Spain, 1972-1984; box 123; Program Proposals, Binational Foundations and Commissions, Fulbright Program, CU; UAL.

<sup>59</sup> “Annual Program Proposal of the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain,” 1978; Spain, 1972-1984; box 123; Program Proposals, Binational Foundations and Commissions, Fulbright Program, CU; UAL.

<sup>60</sup> “American Specialist Program and Country Plan Proposal for Spain,” October 29, 1975; AMSPECs-Spain; box 141; American Specialist Files, American Specialist Program; Special Programs; CU; UAL.

relations on international trade. They requested at least one STAG and a government spokesman with suggestions such as the father of containment George Kennan and future National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski.<sup>61</sup> During the 1975-76 school year, USIS Madrid appeared clairvoyant as they decided on programs with themes of democracy and NATO. Both these played vital roles in projecting the United States to Spain, especially as this was the school year that Franco died, and the transition began. The post aimed “The Federalist Experience in American History” for April 1976, and proposed a security, deterrence, and NATO seminar for February and March of that same year.<sup>62</sup>

The late 1970s brought change to the Fulbright program and stagnation. In April 1978, the USIA and the State Department’s Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs (CU) merged to form the United States International Communication Agency (ICA).<sup>63</sup> The Fulbright program, which had been housed at CU, was now under the umbrella of ICA and the exchange programs became part of the information program.<sup>64</sup> ICA alongside Jimmy Carter worked to strengthen cultural exchanges especially with the “successor generation.” This was the young adult demographic in Western Europe that had no personal experience in World War II or the Marshall Plan. The exchange programs of ICA allowed the United States to interact with youths “with ways of thinking and decision-making that took a close transatlantic relationship for granted.”<sup>65</sup> The focus

---

<sup>61</sup> “Thematic Program Resource Support-FY-1975,” August 19, 1974; AMSPECs-Spain; box 141; American Specialist Files, American Specialist Program; Special Programs; CU; UAL.

<sup>62</sup> “Agency Support to Post Project Proposals for FY 1976,” August 13, 1975; AMSPECs-Spain; box 141; American Specialist Files, American Specialist Program; Special Programs; CU; UAL.

<sup>63</sup> Cull, *USIA*, 361.

<sup>64</sup> Lonnie R. Johnson, “The Fulbright Program and the Philosophy and Geography of US Exchange Programs Since World War II” in *Global Exchanges: Scholarships and Transnational Circulations in the Modern World* eds. Ludovic Tournès and Giles Scott-Smith (New York: Berghahn, 2018), 175.

<sup>65</sup> Giles Scott-Smith, “Networks of Influence: U.S. Exchange Programs and Western Europe in the 1980s” in *The United States and Public Diplomacy: New Directions in Cultural and International History* eds. Kenneth A. Osgood and Brian C. Etheridge (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2010), 351.



from Carter was to strengthen exchange programs under USICA, but the funding for the Fulbright program reached lows under his administration.

In addition to the ICA, the late 1970s saw a steady decline in funding for educational exchanges. The United States contributions began declining during the 1974-75 school year from \$617,000 to \$183,429; and, by 1978, U.S. contributions strained to reach \$180,000.<sup>66</sup> Spain, like some other European governments, increased their financial contributions to Fulbright exchanges.<sup>67</sup> The largest contribution made by Spain was in 1976 with \$132,302, the same year the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation went into effect. These budgetary limitations greatly affected the number of participants from both countries. The total number of participants in the 1980-1981 school year was nine—four Americans and five Spaniards.<sup>68</sup>

Despite the cut in funding, the Fulbright program had a few new initiatives planned for Spain to develop soft power. Labor, the university community, and media became new focuses during the 1977-1978 academic year. These choices are interesting as these subjects were either legalized or underwent dramatic shifts from the Franco era. The United States planned to send labor leaders who were “of signal importance” to Spain, which included young trade union leaders, labor lawyers, and labor journalists.<sup>69</sup>

The reason labor was given priority was because of the legalization of trade unions.

---

<sup>66</sup> “Annual Report Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain Program Year 1973,” October 15, 1974; Annual Reports, 1971-1974; box 431; Spain, Western Europe, CIES; UAL. “Annual Report Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain, Program Year 1974,” October 15, 1975; Annual Reports, 1975-1976; box 431; Spain, Western Europe, CIES; UAL. “Annual Report Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain Program Year 1977,” October 1, 1978; Annual Reports, 1977-79, 1980-81; box 431; Spain, Western Europe, CIES; UAL.

<sup>67</sup> Scott-Smith, “Laying the Foundations,” 60.

<sup>68</sup> “Annual Program Proposal of the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain,” 1981; Spain, 1972-84; box 123; Program Proposals, Binational Foundations and Commissions, Fulbright Program, CU; UAL.

<sup>69</sup> “CU Section of Country Plan Proposal, FY 77/78,” June 8, 1976; CU/WE FY 1977 (1); box 14; Country Program Plans; CU Organization and Administration; CU; UAL.

Second and third priority were political decisionmakers and top economists, specifically anyone who dealt in important U.S.-Spain interests like energy, food policy, trade negotiations, environment, and consumer issues.<sup>70</sup> There was also interest in journalism as the transition to democracy allowed more freedom of the press. USIS Madrid believed the trend of liberalizing and editorializing the news would turn the media into the “opinion molders and makers.”<sup>71</sup> Therefore, journalist tours of the United States became vital to plans for 1978. This included up to three journalists per trip that focused on public opinion polls and military affairs. USIS Madrid identified prime interests of Spanish journalists would be the “1978 House and Senate elections, the general trend in American politics and society, and the U.S./Spain/NATO/EEC relationships.”<sup>72</sup> Further, these journalists would incorporate regional areas such as the Basques and Catalans.

By the 1980s, the Fulbright program in Spain underwent dramatic changes by involving the private sector to new program initiatives. Edward C. McBride became the cultural attaché at the Madrid embassy in the late 1980s. He described how Felipe González wanted an expansion of the Fulbright program, and the United States happily obliged. The base agreement provided funds for educational exchanges, especially for Fulbright, but the United States opened funding opportunities from the private sector. McBride believed this “would be my most significant accomplishment in Spain.”<sup>73</sup> When he entered the program it was funded with \$2.5 million, but the budget exceeded \$10 million when he left.<sup>74</sup> McBride and the embassy approached a number of private companies to provide funds, such as IBM, Ford, and Merrill Lynch. These companies

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Interview with McBride.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

sponsored copious scholarships and branded them as well such as the Fulbright-IBM scholarship or Fulbright-Ford scholarship. McBride explained the terms were exclusive with the companies:

The agreement we struck with the companies in exchange for their contribution was unique, and they had no say so on the selection or the discipline or anything. They were very generous about it. But what we did agree was the candidates who went off on these grants, when they came back from Spain, the IBM or whoever the sponsor was, had the first crack at employing that individual, and if they wanted to offer him a job, that was fine. He had no obligation to take it, but they had the first right of refusal so to speak.<sup>75</sup>

Similarly, Spain brought private companies into the fold for Fulbright funding. In March 1979, the Bank of Bilbao's Board of Directors approved the funding of a new grant program for Spanish graduate students to study in the United States.<sup>76</sup>

While they sought new methods of funding, the Fulbright program also considered new and different subjects for educational exchanges including Spanish Studies, Environmental Studies, student counselling, and a return to science and technology. Due to an increase in demands for U.S. graduate students, Fulbright initiated a new project on Spanish Studies where students used funding for research on doctoral dissertations and performing arts. Further, there was increasing interest among Spanish students to travel to the United States to learn about the U.S. educational system for comparison to the Spanish educational reforms. This spurred Fulbright to begin a student counseling program for Spanish exchange students to study at the undergraduate and graduate level. In addition, the contributions from the Bank of Bilbao brought specialized programs. Subjects that had been under the Applied Sciences—ecology, urban development, energy sources, and transportation—moved to Environmental Studies

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> "Annual Program Proposal," 1981.

thanks to the donations of the Bank of Bilbao.<sup>77</sup> Yet, the major initiative of funding from both the Fulbright and from the bases agreement in the 1980s dealt with science and technology. By 1984, the program explained that the greatest number of grantees concentrated on science or technology fields, which included agrarian science, public health, chemistry, telecommunications, earth science, engineering, life sciences, mathematics, and physics.<sup>78</sup> In addition, over sixty U.S. universities operated a summer or full-year program in Spain with the Spanish scientific community working closely with the United States for research projects.<sup>79</sup>

Like the Fulbright program using the base agreement for funds, the United States and Spain continued their work on science and technology cooperation that the agreements established. A prominent figure in the development of science and technology in U.S.-Spain relations was Francis M. Kinnelly. He served as the science and technology attaché in the Economic Section of the Madrid embassy from 1981 to 1985. During this period, the program saw funding rise from \$4 million annually to \$7 million, which Kinnelly explains was “a very heady sum.”<sup>80</sup> The lead institutions in the development of science and technology were the State Department and the Foreign Ministry. Kinnelly worked with Fidel López Álvarez and Antonio de Oyarzábal, the latter becoming the Spanish ambassador to the United States in 1996. The Spanish took the

---

<sup>77</sup> “Annual Program Proposal of the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain,” 1982; Spain, 1972-84; box 123; Program Proposals, Binational Foundations and Commissions, Fulbright Program, CU; UAL.

<sup>78</sup> “Annual Program Proposal of the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States of America and Spain,” 1984; Spain, 1972-84; box 123; Program Proposals, Binational Foundations and Commissions, Fulbright Program, CU; UAL.

<sup>79</sup> “Spain: Post Report, December 1982,” U.S. Department of State; Post Report Spain; box 130; Series XV: Publications, Subseries G: Post Reports; Department of State: Office of the Historian; RRL.

<sup>80</sup> Interview with Francis M. Kinnelly, June 4, 1997, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

initiative and created proposals for joint research sent to American researchers.<sup>81</sup>

However, Americans often joined the initiatives because they offered them research opportunities outside of the United States.

Kinnelly details a few projects between the United States and Spain. One project Kinnelly highlights dealt with solar technology. In Almería, Spain built a solar tower that reflected rays onto solar panels.<sup>82</sup> While Americans could do similar research in California, Kinnelly argues that the Plataforma Solar de Almería provided U.S. scientists an opportunity to develop and test new technology. Another project Fulbright funded dealt with marine biology. Ken Tenore from Georgia Tech headed one research project. A team of Spanish and American scientists researched the Spanish rías, long inlets on the Galician coast. Kinnelly explained, “There were very strong upwelling of water on the Atlantic shelf outside the rías that brought in water very rich in nutrients. As a result, there is a tremendous production of mussels and other fisheries inside these rías.”<sup>83</sup> This study produced a number of academic papers and began a boom of marine biology in Spain. Kinnelly details how the United States brought young Spanish scientists to American universities to earn doctorates in marine biology and then return to Spain.

Yet, the major project between the United States and Spain dealt with nuclear energy and weapons. Spain had over eight major power reactors under operation and six under construction by beginning of the Reagan administration. However, the construction of a plant in Bilbao caused a halt in nuclear power plants in Spain. ETA attacked or assassinated directors of the project, set fires, and sent threats, which forced those in charge to halt plans for other reactors. In addition, General Electric and Westinghouse

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

worked with Spanish counterparts to build a plant to produce nuclear fuel for reactors. However, the United States discovered that the Spanish military considered using the manufactured fuel for nuclear powered submarines that would protect the Canary Islands. This controversial decision gave the United States the ability to sell the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which Spain had not signed. As Kinnelly explains,

When we finally found this out, we were able to explain to the Spanish military that if they joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the treaty permitted countries to develop nuclear technology for defensive nonweapons purposes. They would be free to build a nuclear powered submarine, but they would have to do this on their own, without outside help. Under the treaty, they couldn't put nuclear missiles on these subs, but they had no plans to do that in any case. We also had experts explain to them that the technology involved at this fuel fabrication plant just wouldn't work. So, finally, they decided to join the Nonproliferation Treaty. And they eventually gave up on the idea of building nuclear subs.<sup>84</sup>

While these scientific projects worked with transnational companies, there was some resistance within Spain on cooperation with the United States on science and technology. Kinnelly explains that Spanish laboratories were making links to northern Europe, and many of the labs at universities were resistant of the United States. The universities “were very insular still ... [and] it was rather difficult to get them to move out of their shells, even when there were so many opportunities to work with American scientists.”<sup>85</sup>

Education in Spain played a pivotal role in the *aperturismo* and the Spanish transition to democracy. It helped invite modernity into Spanish society. The 1970 General Law of Education helped spark equitable access to education for these outside the upper classes in Spain. This further spread democratic ideals to the regions of Spain, and the United States capitalized on this by using educational exchanges for soft power. Both the GO and NGO played a role in the development and implementation of the

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

General Law. Yet, it was Fraenkel and the FF who provided the most help to the Ministry of Education during the reform efforts. The Fulbright program and U.S. government remained interested in the development of American Studies programs to put in classrooms for all Spanish citizens.

However, as the transition began, the FF became less involved in educational exchanges in Spain and more involved with Spain's place in academia. The use of Spain's transition to democracy as an example for academics allowed the country to become a major talking point. Yet, the FF rarely gave money to those studying *in* Spain, instead focusing on conferences and publications. This allowed the Fulbright program to be the lone organization in exchanges with Spain. Despite inconsistencies with funding, Fulbright allowed the United States to develop soft power by integrating specific subjects into exchanges. These subjects often occurred during key moments of the transition, such as the focus on journalism as Spain gained freedom of the press.

As Brademas said in his speech at NYU, the role of education and culture are pivotal to the development of peace and understanding. The United States and Spain understood this during the transition to democracy. The FF and Fulbright worked together to produce U.S. soft power in Spain. The FF played a key role in the growth of education reform. Further, during the early years of the transition, the FF provided money for educational exchanges. Fulbright continually worked with the Spanish Ministry of Education to provide exchanges between the two countries. The FF and Fulbright illustrate how a GO and NGO can work together towards the same end, despite differing courses on how to get there.

## CHAPTER 5

### D is for Democracy: Television and Soft Power

At 1:14 AM on February 24, 1981, King Juan Carlos I of Spain sat at a desk to speak to the Spanish people via a live television broadcast. In the previous hours, the Spanish military held the government hostage in an attempted coup d'état, which the leaders claimed to be doing at the express orders of the king. Those within Spain watched as Lieutenant-Colonel Antonio Tejero led Guardia Civil officers into Congress to disrupt the confirmation of new Prime Minister Leopoldo Calvo-Sotelo. Throughout these eighteen hours, Spaniards watched replays of the coup and news updates as the military continued to hold the government hostage. However, Juan Carlos did not approve of this coup and went on television to denounce it. He stoically gripped a piece of paper, dressed in his military uniform, and sat in front of the Spanish coat of arms. Juan Carlos looked directly into the camera and explained the situation to his country. He concluded by stating, "The Crown cannot tolerate, in any degree, the actions that interferes with the constitution approved by the Spanish people." In one and a half minutes, the King united the Spanish people, upheld the Constitution, and solidified the transition to democracy.



The broadcast of 23-F illustrates how important the medium of television was to solidifying Spanish democracy. Public television broadcast the parliamentary session of Calvo-Sotelo's confirmation, and replayed the coup several times throughout the night. The danger of broadcasting the coup was sending a message that democracy was in peril. As historian H. Rosi Song illustrates, the role of public television "was to firmly establish the narrative of the political transition being engineered by the political elite."<sup>1</sup> With the political actors of the transition taken hostage, doubts may have been sewed among the public regarding the transition. This makes Juan Carlos's declaration such an important aspect of 23-F failure. Juan Carlos, the symbol of the new Spanish democracy, went on television and proclaimed that the generals were not acting in his name. His message played to millions of Spaniards in the late hours of the night, and it "encouraged many key institutions that had hitherto remained silent ... to issue statements in support of democracy."<sup>2</sup>

Television is an interesting medium and technology to utilize when analyzing the soft power of a nation. The wide availability of television sets in certain countries allows for a broader dissemination of information. Spain was no different. Though newspapers and radios were major forms of communication that the public used, televisions became a growing interest to Spaniards and the availability grew throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The USIA used television as a method to engage directly with the Spanish public through news programs and documentaries regarding current political developments in the United States. During the latter years of the Franco regime, USIS Madrid worked with state-run TVE to broadcast American specials and news programs. In addition, television was a

---

<sup>1</sup> Song, 99.

<sup>2</sup> Powell, *Juan Carlos of Spain*, 172.

critical aspect of the Spanish transition to democracy. Television liberalized as Spain did. TVE moved from state-run TV to channels for cultural programming and the creation of channels for autonomous regions as the transition continued

The wider availability of televisions occurred in Spain as the educational reforms of the 1970s happened. This led Spanish producers to consider the development of children's educational television. The use of educational programming for children gave the United States a new venue to promote American soft power. However, the most famous example of international children's programming was not through USIA but through an NGO. CTW had success with other nations in creating co-productions of educational programming. With Spain, CTW mirrored their approach with Latin America with the creation of *Barrio Sésamo*. However, cultural differences between Spanish and American producers nearly brought the show down before the airing of the pilot. Yet, CTW learned from their issues in the first season of *Barrio Sésamo* with other programs and the second season.

### **USIA and Television in Spain**

The advent of television provided the USIA with a new channel to dispense public diplomacy. Burnett Anderson, a Public Affairs Officer (PAO) at USIS Madrid, produced a study in which he explored the history of television in Spain, what programs TVE airs, and who is the audience for Spanish television. Though initially autonomous, state television took control in October 1962. Anderson explained that TVE aired “approximately 70 hours per week with an additional 6 hours per week dedicated to educational television.”<sup>3</sup> The programs that TVE aired underwent a double scrutiny of

---

<sup>3</sup> “Television in Spain,” April 1, 1968; MV - Motion Pictures and Television, 1968; box 53; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

ensorship. First, “advisory commissions” inspected the programs, and then underwent “content evaluation.”<sup>4</sup> Around 30 percent of the programs aired were of foreign origin with over three-fourths of programming from the United States. However, Spain predominately received foreign news from Eurovision. TVE expanded to a second channel—UHF— which broadcast cultural programs like concerts and plays. To fit this plan and the call for more production, TVE looked to expand out of the studios at the Prado del Rey into larger, separate facilities.

In 1969, USIA contracted the Instituto de la Opinion Publica in Madrid to study the media habits of targeted groups. These groups included university professors, secondary school teachers, university students, businesspersons, media leaders, and political leaders. The study group compiled a sample of 1,205 people from Madrid, Cataluña, Bilbao, and Andalucía. The questions for the study included what domestic and/or foreign newspapers and magazines were read, how often and at what times did the participants watch television, and how often and what radio programs did the participants listen to.<sup>5</sup> In June 1970, the USIA received the completed survey, which produced some surprising results. The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) was the most listened to foreign radio, and Radio Moscow had more listenership than the Voice of America. Thirty-three percent claimed “never to listen to radio,” 21 percent claimed to listen every day, 19 percent listened to FM stations, and less than one percent listened to shortwave radios.<sup>6</sup> A small portion of those surveyed read foreign newspapers and magazines with

---

<sup>4</sup> John Hooper, *The New Spaniards* (New York: Penguin Books, 1995), 307-8. Those who watched and censored programs included judges, priests, and armed forces officers.

<sup>5</sup> Survey on Reading, Radio-Listening and Television-Viewing Habits, February 1970; SP 7001 Target Group Media Habits 1970, Pt. 1; box 37; Office of Research, Records of Research Projects Western Europe, 1964-1973; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>6</sup> Media Group Habits Results, June 17, 1970; SP 7001 Target Group Media Habits 1970, Pt. 1; box 37; Office of Research, Records of Research Projects Western Europe, 1964-1973; RG 306; NARA.

the French titles of *Le Monde* and *Paris Match* being the most read.<sup>7</sup> Fifty-eight percent of the sample claimed to receive their information on world events from the press and only 19 percent from television.<sup>8</sup>

While radio and newspapers appeared to control how the Spanish populace saw their media, television had the widest audience. According to the survey, 83 percent watch television at least once a week.<sup>9</sup> Viewership cut across occupational and age categories, but university students and professors claimed they never watched television.<sup>10</sup> The prevailing viewership came during “primetime”—9:30 P.M. to midnight. Most commonly, news programs aired during this time slot. Besides the news other productions viewed included those dealing with international issues and presentations of classical and popular music, but the least popular were quiz shows.<sup>11</sup> Old movies, such as *The Benny Goodman Story* and various films of Clark Gable and Marilyn Monroe films, were broadcast during primetime as well to great popularity.<sup>12</sup> In the most striking aspect of the survey, most of the media information from the U.S. Embassy was only received by political and media leaders as opposed to students and university professors. What the results of the survey showed to the USIA was that they were not breaking Europe’s hold of the press and radio. However, television may provide an opening. Students claimed to receive much of their news from television. This survey provided the United States with the knowledge that to reach the younger demographic they needed to provide news programs, documentaries, and cultural programs to sway the

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Report on Television and Radio, January 29, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

television audience. The USIA utilized soft power to provide the Spanish audience with the American news, politics, and entertainment.

This survey gave the USIA some problems to consider in their approach to Spain. One was the viewership of the Apollo XI mission. Often the USIA provided films that dealt with the Apollo program, but some included television programs. Though Spain received a plethora of space public diplomacy, only 36 percent saw a documentary on the Apollo XI mission, and of those only 7 percent saw it at a theater. However, of those who saw films related to the Apollo mission, 26 percent saw it on television.<sup>13</sup> Even though Juan Carlos and Sofia promoted space and science, the small viewership numbers depicts a Spanish public not as captivated by space travel as the Spanish royals were. Another issue was the foot traffic at American sites in Spain. According to those surveyed, 82 percent never visited Casa Americana, 93 percent never visited the North American Institute in Barcelona, and, of those who were leaders, only 13 percent received their news from the American Embassy. Finally, the survey also produced one glaring issue. The questionnaire asked if there was a difference or harmony between the United States and Spain. Only 21 percent felt cohesion between the United States and Spain, 31 percent believed differences existed, and the perceptions of these differences increased with youths.<sup>14</sup> Though the issues existed, this sample group provided the USIA with the knowledge of the wide television audience in the Spanish regions.

In a document from the next year, Albert Harkness, Jr., a PAO at USIS Madrid, produced a report for USIA on the use of television and radio in Spain in 1971. This report showed dramatic changes in just a single year of Spanish television. Harkness

---

<sup>13</sup> Media Group Habits Results.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

provided a breakdown of the program categories played by TVE. News and coverage of public events were 30 percent of programs, music and entertainment were 33 percent, educational and cultural programs were 32 percent, and political content was 5 percent.<sup>15</sup> A significant detail in the report discussed the growth of Spanish television sets. Harkness explains that Spanish television was “experiencing growing pains” as the total number of television sets grew from 2,500,000 to 4,000,000 in just two years.<sup>16</sup> This expansion of television sets in Spain provided TVE with a much wider viewing audience, and, in theory, amplification of USIS Madrid’s content. However, TVE held final control over material shown to the country, and this is evident with the fallout of the Burgos trial. Harkness revealed that TVE provided their domestic audience a full account of the trial proceedings but only gave the Spanish government’s point of view. This clashed with the foreign news portrayal of the trial, which illustrated the tough stance of the Franco regime. The commutation of the sentences gave foreign publics a “happy note, but left many questions in the minds of Spanish listeners unanswered regarding their image in the rest of the world.”<sup>17</sup> Further, Harkness contends that the coverage of the Burgos trial hindered the prestige of some foreign media, especially the BBC because Spaniards now believed it was no longer objective.

USIS Madrid provided several television programs and films to TVE to broadcast because of the newly expanded viewership and the fallout of the Burgos trial coverage. These programs provided the United States with soft power. Nye argues that a country’s soft power rests on three resources—its culture, its political values, and its foreign

---

<sup>15</sup> Report on Television and Radio, January 29, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

policies.<sup>18</sup> These three coalesced into the television programs and films given to TVE. As historian Pablo León-Aguinaga explains, the USIS's workload was twofold: "it had to act as intermediary between the public-service entity and American private broadcasters in the purchase of broadcasting rights and provide informative material for TVE news, mainly through the provisions of the USIA 'Washington Correspondent' format and documentaries on specific subjects."<sup>19</sup> Further, the United States was aware that the younger generation of Spain—part of the "successor generation" in Western Europe—was watching the United States. In a memorandum to the State Department and USIA, USIS Madrid explained that this generation did not witness World War II and could not see the United States' ability "to solve its own internal domestic problems and divisions. What we do at home to put our own house in order will be closely watched [in Spain]."<sup>20</sup> With this dual assignment, USIS Madrid utilized soft power by showing programs that emphasized U.S.-Spanish cultural harmony, providing media that explored the issue of race in the United States, and began showing Spaniards how the American democratic process worked.

The United States considered how to disprove the Spanish belief that the United States and Spain had fundamental differences that previous media surveys illustrated. USIS Madrid sent material to TVE to "project a *simpática* image of the United States in Spain."<sup>21</sup> One example was a television program that featured Ambassador Robert Hill being honored at the ranch of Spain's number one bullfighter, Manuel Benitez "El

---

<sup>18</sup> Nye, *Soft Power*, 11.

<sup>19</sup> Pablo León-Aguinaga, "U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democracy Promotion in Authoritarian Spain: Approaches, Themes, and Messages" in *U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain*, 104.

<sup>20</sup> "Educational and Cultural Exchange: Annual Report for Spain for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970," Spain, 1958-1970; box 320; Post Reports, CU, UAL.

<sup>21</sup> Monthly Highlights: May 1971, June 3, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

Cordobes.” Another attempt to improve the image of the United States was the airing of “Black Revolution.” This two-part documentary explored the Civil Rights Movement in the United States. TVE co-produced and aired “Black Revolution” during the primetime slot. The production claimed to be a “generally objective and sympathetic” view, and hoped to “engender an improved understanding in Spain of the complexity of this topic.”<sup>22</sup> Further, it could help boost the United States over the BBC, which still faced issues of objectivity from the Burgos trial. “Black Revolution” provided a positive experience between USIS Madrid and TVE and led to the consideration of airing two additional specials on the United States. The first discussed ecology and the issues of air pollution, and the second was about the upcoming 1972 primary elections. The second special is of interest because it gave the United States an avenue to illustrate how American style democracy worked.

Following the death of Franco and as the transition began, television censorship slowly evolved with the rise of regional television. During the debates on the Moncloa Pacts in 1977, the Socialists and Communists insisted on RTVE becoming objective and ending state run television. Spain passed the Statute of Radio and Television in 1980 as another expansion of television ownership occurred. The law “established norms to ensure a plurality of political influence over the national network, ... to order state guarantees that broadcasting be treated as an essential public service, to protect open and free expression, and to suggest that the autonomous regional communities of Spain might

---

<sup>22</sup> Monthly Highlights: September 1971, October 14, 1971; INF 2 - General Reports 1971; box 56; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.



have new broadcast channels operating in their zones.”<sup>23</sup> Soon after this, Spanish regions began their own television services. The Basque began airing Euskal Telebista (ETB) in 1983, Catalonia began TV-3 in 1983, and Galicia and Valencia shortly afterwards.<sup>24</sup> Further, the Third Channel Law passed in 1984 that denationalized television in Spain.

All these laws and the attempted coup occurred as Spain witnessed a growth in household television sets and satellites. In research done by the USIA, the Spanish population in 1982 was 37.75 million, and over 10.5 million television sets were part of households.<sup>25</sup> This is part of a larger pattern in Western Europe from 1975 to 1982. The number of television sets in 1975 in Western Europe was over 103,000,000, and by 1982 that number grew to just over 149,000,000. This was a growth of 1.4 percent in eight years.<sup>26</sup> Further research from the USIA showed that more Spaniards named television than any other mass media and academic studies “as their ‘most useful’ source of information on the United States.”<sup>27</sup> The opportunity for new regional channels and wider availability of television sets expanded the use of USIA newscasts. One new venture was WORLDNET, which sent its own programs and newscasts that “offered a visual equivalent of [Voice of America]” for those with satellite dishes.<sup>28</sup> The USIA sent two four-men teams to Europe to survey Embassy sites—one of which included Madrid—to decide whether they were structurally prepared for a TVRO (television receive-only)

---

<sup>23</sup> Richard Maxwell “Spatial Eruptions, Global Grids: Regionalist TV in Spain and Dialectics of Identity Politics” in *Refiguring Spain: Cinema, Media, Representation* ed. Marsha Kinder (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 261-2.

<sup>24</sup> Hooper, 313.

<sup>25</sup> “Trends in Worldwide Availability of Television Sets,” February 1, 1984; Television Studies, 1983-1990; box 118; Subject Files 1953-2000; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> “Spanish Public Critical of Wide Range of U.S. Policies,” January 23, 1986; Spain-1986 (7); box RAC 4; Peter Sommer Files; White House Staff and Office Files; NSC Staff and Offices; RRL.

<sup>28</sup> Nicholas Cull, “Film as Public Diplomacy: The USIA’s Cold War at Twenty-Four Frames per Second,” in *The United States and Public Diplomacy*, 278.

dish.<sup>29</sup> On June 2, 1983, the USIA began a three-month trial of a television news program for European audiences, the TV Satellite File. USIA Director Wick explained that a major objective of TV Satellite File was “to bring the highest levels of our Administration to foreign TV audiences through our programming.”<sup>30</sup> This emphasis on news programs placed a reduced priority on other USIA programs.

One of the major programs that saw a deficit of coverage was educational programming. Recall, León-Aguinaga’s assertion of USIS Madrid’s twofold purpose. The second objective of the USIS’s workload was selling private broadcasters. A specific example of a private company that worked with TVE to produce a co-production would be CTW. One producer of a children’s program in the 1980s explains that public television offered a chance for children’s television programs in the late 1970s and early 1980s. However, she explains that while public television existed in Spain there was few educational programs, and “nobody in Spain is campaigning for education on TV.”<sup>31</sup> This is significant because children’s programs offer a path for soft power. CTW helped produce a Spanish *Sesame Street* to fulfill the growing need for educational television in Spain. The soft power of children’s television is like educational exchanges in that both use American ideas and values that the United States can reinforce through pedagogy. Though CTW’s co-productions lend themselves to soft power goals, the background of productions leads to questions of whether the show is soft power or cultural imperialism.

---

<sup>29</sup> “Site Surveys for WORLDNET Reception via TVRO Dishes,” September 14, 1984; USIA (07/16/1984-9/14/1984); RAC box 10; Series I Subject files; Walter Raymond Files; RRL.

<sup>30</sup> “Taping for USIA’s Inaugural ‘Satellite File’ to Europe,” June 1, 1983; Taping Session, 06/01/1983 (2); box 37; Office of Media Relations Records; RRL.

<sup>31</sup> Interview with Maria Gustafson, June 13, 1983; Spain: 3-2-1 Contacto-Transcript, 1983; box 369; Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; International Series; Children’s Television Workshop (hereby referred to as CTW) Archives; University of Maryland Library (hereby referred to as UMDL).

In the case of Spain, CTW's control of content, production notes, and cultural misunderstanding nearly damaged U.S. soft power.

### **CTW and *Barrio Sésamo***

Educational television in Spain prior to CTW and the creation of *Barrio Sésamo* was minimal. In January 1968, before the educational reform passed, TVE inaugurated a long-discussed idea of creating programming aimed at children and limited it to one hour per day on Monday through Saturday. PAO Anderson explained that TVE's plan for educational programs was an "ambitious plan" to provide "a complete elementary education to those who cannot attend regular schools, or adults who missed the opportunity when they were children."<sup>32</sup> The long-range plans were to provide "standard secondary education leading to an official high school certificate."<sup>33</sup> This was an largescale plan to push education in Spain, but this would be taken up with the educational reform efforts to come later. Yet, the need for educational television series forced TVE to expand their studio facilities at the Prado del Rey. New separate studios began construction in the late 1960s for educational programs, but all productions had to halt until the building additions finished. Similarly, the emphasis on elementary audiences waited until the end of the Franco regime with CTW co-production.

In early 1975, TVE approached CTW to request the rights for the broadcast of *Sesame Street*. Prior to this in the late 1960s, CTW and Jim Henson changed the production and reputation of educational television. Children's programs should be the perfect balance of education and entertainment. Henson had previous experience working with the U.S. government. In 1961, the U.S. Department of Agriculture hosted a

---

<sup>32</sup> "Television in Spain," April 1, 1968; MV - Motion Pictures and Television, 1968; box 53; Country Files for Spain, 1957-1971; RG 306; NARA.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

weeklong U.S. Food Fair in Hamburg, Germany, and contacted Henson about performing one of his popular puppet acts. Henson and Jerry Juhl tested out new puppets—one of which became the Swedish Chef—and received rave reviews. The next year USIA sent Henson back to Germany, but this time to Berlin for Green Week.<sup>34</sup> Later, Joan Ganz Cooney approached Henson about joining CTW to produce new programming that would be both educational and entertaining to children. Prior educational television had “stone-faced educators either staring directly into the camera lecturing, or writing on a blackboard,” and CTW envisioned “a fun, fast-paced kids’ show with content steeped in the latest pedagogies and education research.”<sup>35</sup> Henson agreed to work with CTW as long as he maintained ownership of the characters.<sup>36</sup> This would be the model going forward for CTW when working with other creative teams.

By the early 1970s, CTW began co-productions with other nations to create local versions of *Sesame Street*. As Charlotte F. Cole points out, most co-productions began “at (or near) junctions of revolutionary shift” within a country.<sup>37</sup> Spain was no different as talks began the same year as Franco’s death. When CTW first entered a deal with a foreign nation, they provided dubbed versions of *Sesame Street*. If these proved popular, CTW signed a co-production deal with said nation. The initial proposal from RTVE was to broadcast eighteen minutes a day of original material for preschoolers, and use three to seven minutes of “Open Sesame” material, which is dubbed over original *Sesame Street* episodes.<sup>38</sup> However, the proposal from RTVE was technically a co-production, which

---

<sup>34</sup> Brian Jay Jones, *Jim Henson: The Biography* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2013), 89-92.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 141.

<sup>37</sup> Charlotte F. Cole, “.29: The Global Sesame Effect,” in *The Sesame Effect: The Global Impact of the Longest Street in the World* eds. Charlotte F. Cole and June H. Lee (New York: Routledge, 2016), 21.

<sup>38</sup> Lutrelle Horne to Dave Connell, March 5, 1975; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Bario Sesamo - Correspondence, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

CTW avoided early in negotiations with foreign broadcasters. Director of the International Division of CTW Lutrelle Horne explains that the proposal from RTVE “would be virtually impossible to maintain quality control because we would not be dealing with a CTW production, but something else.”<sup>39</sup> CTW and TVE agreed following negotiations to air thirteen and a half minute programs, but CTW appeared to be apprehensive of their new partner. TVE paid 1,900 pesetas per minute and planned to air the program in Castilian Spanish in October 1975 on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays at 7:15 P.M.<sup>40</sup> This aired during what is considered primetime for children’s programming just before primetime for adults.<sup>41</sup>

By September 1975, CTW and TVE began advertising the broadcast of *¡Abrete Sésamo!*, the name designated for Spain’s version of “Open Sesame.” The press release described *¡Abrete Sésamo!* as consisting of “puppet sketches, live action films, and animated cartoons which make for a fast moving, entertaining and educationally balanced format culturally applicable to Spain.”<sup>42</sup> In addition, the press release emphasized that the program contained universal educational material, “including introduction to cognitive subjects such as relational concepts, recognizing geometric forms, letter and number identification and a wide range of affect topics under the heading of emotions and self-identification. They also include subjects such as environment, the family and the home,

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Peter Orton to Dave Connell, September 2, 1975; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Bario Sesamo - Correspondence, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

<sup>41</sup> Kristin Engstrand, “Barrio Sésamo/Barri Sèsam and the Global/Local Dynamic: A Case Study of the Spanish Cultural Adaptation of Sesame Street” (master’s thesis, University of Washington, 1997), 65.

<sup>42</sup> Press release, “TVE Introduces Abrete Sésamo A Spanish Language Adaptation of the Acclaimed Children’s TV Show,” September 1975; Spain Abrete Sesamo - Press Kit, 1975; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

cooperation, social attitudes and social roles and functions.”<sup>43</sup> This press release brings to the forefront an interesting issue regarding CTW co-productions. Though the company claims to provide other countries with topics that can easily cross cultures, foreign viewers often interpret the subjects of the show as American perspectives. The foreign audience is aware the show is made in the United States and thus cannot extract the shows from America. As Heather Hendershot explains, CTW’s perspective of their co-productions is that “the bickering Ernie and Bert have no American qualities; their middle-class American clothing, apartment, and furniture are all neutral.”<sup>44</sup> However, these distinctive American qualities come through to the television audience. This illustrates that though they were unaware, CTW provided the United States with soft power in Spain. The press responses to *¡Abrete Sesamo!* provide evidence for this.

The reaction to *¡Abrete Sesamo!* was predominately positive, but there were some within Spain who could not disassociate the show from the United States. CTW collected several reviews from newspapers and magazines throughout the many regions of Spain.<sup>45</sup> The positive reviews of the show emphasized the success *Sesame Street* had in the United States and the history of the program. According to a review in *Ya*, one of the most popular newspapers in Spain, *¡Abrete Sesamo!* was “a result of profound investigation of psychological characteristics of kids under 7 and their reactions in front of TV. From its beginning, [*Sesame Street*] has been considered revolutionary.”<sup>46</sup> In addition, the magazine *Garbo* praised the show for using language directly for children, and applauded

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Heather Hendershot, “*Sesame Street: Cognition and Communications Imperialism*” in *Kids’ Media Culture* ed. Marsha Kinder (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 161.

<sup>45</sup> The quotes from the reviews are from either typed or handwritten translations from the Spanish periodicals.

<sup>46</sup> “Comienza «Ábrete Sesamo» Programa Infantil «Revolucion»” in *YA*, October 18, 1975; Spain Abrete Sesamo - News Clippings, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives, UMDL.

the U.S. government for funding the non-profit organization that produced the original show.<sup>47</sup> While the show received praise, there was an internal debate over whether or not the show was culturally imperialistic. An article in *El Pueblo* explains that at one time Spain dreaded “the adaptations of these programs to the mentality of our country. It was feared that they could exercise certain colonizing influences on the young. At the moment, it seems, these doubts have been superseded.”<sup>48</sup> In contrast, the women’s magazine, *Diez Minutos*, stressed the concern that the United States was covertly using the show to infiltrate Spanish culture. The article explains that “it is evident that [the show] offers a formidable instrument of cultural and ideological penetration from North America into other countries, attacking the weakest side: the children.”<sup>49</sup> These reviews from the Spanish media are evidence that foreign audiences cannot detach the United States from *Sesame Street*. While there was debate over the impact of *¡Abrete Sésamo!*, the success of the show brought TVE and CTW to begin negotiations of a co-production.

After the debut and success of *¡Abrete Sésamo!* in late 1975, CTW and TVE entered negotiations for a co-production of original programs to air by 1977. In the negotiations, CTW suggested the production of sixty-five episodes at twenty-five minutes in length, and 50 percent of the material came from CTW. The supplied material from CTW consisted of Muppets, live action, and animated segments. The other 50 percent produced by TVE would consist of Spanish produced studio segments and live action films. In addition, CTW provided production and research expertise to help TVE in their

---

<sup>47</sup> “Por fin, llega «Abrete Sésamo»” in *Garbo*, October 29, 1975; Spain Abrete Sesamo - News Clippings, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives, UMDL.

<sup>48</sup> “¡Abrete Sésamo! Nueva Serie Infantil” in *Pueblo*, October 23, 1975; Spain Abrete Sesamo - News Clippings, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives, UMDL.

<sup>49</sup> “Al Fin, La Calle Sesamo” in *Diez Minutos*, November 8, 1975; Spain Abrete Sesamo - News Clippings, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives, UMDL.

productions and use of *Sesame Street* materials. CTW persuaded TVE that the “combination of the *Sesame Street* material, the research and production consultation, and the co-production process makes for a no risk high quality production.”<sup>50</sup> Some of the suggested topics for the Spanish-produced live action films included how to make food (from bread to cheese), taking public transportation (subway, bus, train), agriculture (growing flowers, berry picking, farming), playing with toys (doll houses, model planes), outdoor activities (riding bikes, hikes, picnics, fishing, swimming), and occupations (factories, fireman, mailman, garbage man, grocer, pilot, carpenter, mechanic).<sup>51</sup>

CTW stressed the close cooperation between the two sides on the production. In a letter to TVE, CTW executives argued that this collaboration “will also help to validate the impact and effectiveness of the programs through formative and (possibly) summative research.”<sup>52</sup> In addition, CTW provided an outline for the development and production timeframe for 1977, as well as the layout of the pilot. From January-February, TVE and CTW would form the curriculum for Spain, do formative research, plan productions, and design the pilot. From March to May, preproduction would occur, the pilot shot, and receive reviews by CTW and TVE. From June-September, preproduction would happen for the series, and by mid-September, the series would go into production and editing. By October 1977, the first episodes would be ready to broadcast.<sup>53</sup> The co-production took on a new name, *Barrio Sésamo*, and by 1977, Spain had their version of *Sesame Street*. However, the early development of *Barrio Sésamo* had issues as TVE

---

<sup>50</sup> “A Proposal to Television Espanola for the Production of a New Series in Cooperation with The Children’s Television Workshop,” July 12, 1976; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo-Correspondence, 1976-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives, UMDL.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> “TVE-CTW Co-Production Activities,” December 1976; Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo - Correspondence, 1975-1976; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives, UMDL.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.



struggled to distance the show from American ideas and concepts, and how to present Spanish culture without the specter of backlash from CTW.

In 1977, the early production of *Barrio Sésamo* proved a growing rift between TVE and CTW. Before discussing the rift, it is important to understand how CTW defined what a co-production was. A co-production consisted of four stages:

First, the country puts together a research team, which is sent to New York City to be trained in conducting formative research (child-testing methods such as the distractor). Summative research is generally too expensive to be undertaken by coproducers. Second, the country goes into preproduction, making some pilot half-hour shows to test for appeal and comprehension. During the third stage, coproducers respond to test results from the second stage, and in the fourth stage they complete all their live-action and animated sequences. Typically, the country makes three hours of original animation and three hours of live-action footage per season of 130 half-hour shows.<sup>54</sup>

However, there soon became an issue with the co-production. Horne traveled to Spain to contact TVE about preproduction where he discovered problems including the effect of political turmoil, numerous personnel changes at TVE, and the unionization of TVE's technical and creative staffs.<sup>55</sup> The major issue that Horne highlighted was the inability of the research staff and production staff to work as a team. Researchers wrote the scripts because of a strike at TVE, which caused inconsistencies with the balance of education and entertainment. This led to other problems such as suspending script writing until the strike ended. In addition, the creative team appeared to discard the curriculum goals required by CTW. Instead of having a distinct curriculum coordinator, the head writer of the show held that position. Horne discussed how there "were no plans to assign weight

---

<sup>54</sup> Hendershot, 162.

<sup>55</sup> Lutrelle Horne, "Spain Trip Report," February 2, 1978; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo-Correspondence, 1977-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

to the various curriculum goals.”<sup>56</sup> Instead, *Barrio Sésamo* writers placed more of an emphasis on Spanish social concerns as opposed to the American influenced curriculum from *Sesame Street*. This is a prime example of the clash between CTW and TVE. Co-productions create a small portion of their own material, but most programs “are composed of pieces culled from the ‘neutral’ library of U.S.-produced material.”<sup>57</sup> Though CTW wanted to enforce the American educational and entertainment objectives of *Sesame Street*, TVE intended to provide a nationalized show dealing with Spanish social and cultural issues.

TVE attempted to integrate Spain into *Barrio Sésamo* through the characters. During pre-production, TVE requested that CTW provide two new puppets made specifically for *Barrio Sésamo*. The first was a main character like Big Bird, “la gallina caponata” or simply Caponata, and Perezgil, a green snail with glasses. The director, Enrique Nicanor González, designed the puppets, and CTW provided the puppets strictly for the TVE production. In addition, the production team designed the human characters to represent different Spanish regions. For example, José, who ran a fish store, was from “‘Andauuz’ (south of Spain) [from Andalucía, or “andaluz”] and speaks with their particular accent.”<sup>58</sup> Carmen was a 17 to 20 year old intended to represent the Spanish “type of woman that is emerging between the young people.”<sup>59</sup> Manolo, a mechanic, was described as a “typical Madrid-type,” and “realistic ... practical. Flirts with girls. He mends what the children bring to him broken.”<sup>60</sup> These human characters coupled with

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Hendershot, 162.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> “Character Descriptions,” undated; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo-Correspondence, 1977-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

the two newly created puppets allowed the producers to integrate a Spanish identity into the show, which “was a clear objective of the early productions.”<sup>61</sup> Though they did not embrace the American scholarly objectives initially, TVE set forth educational goals for *Barrio Sésamo* that represented the Spanish educational system and the new Spain. These included “creativity, Spanish culture, freedom of body, spontaneity, health and hygiene, career awareness, the natural environment, sight words, [and] the life process.”<sup>62</sup>

The characters and educational goals set forth by TVE illustrate how the company planned to inject Spain into the American formula. Caponata and Perezgil represented Spanish Muppets specifically for *Barrio Sésamo*. The characters of José, Carmen, and Manolo each represent an important aspect of the ongoing transition and the trajectory of the democracy. José, though from just one region of Spain, was the embodiment of the multitude of regions of Spain and to show that the culture of Spain was multifaceted and not just centered in Madrid. Carmen provided the audience with a young woman to follow as feminism and gender equality played a role in the democratic transition. As the transition continued women in Spain entered the workforce in rising numbers, divorce was legalized which ended discrimination of married women economically and bans on contraceptives and abortions were lifted. Manolo was the caretaker of the children’s problems, much as Madrid intended to do for Spaniards during the transition. The educational goals additionally prove that TVE intended a nationalized broadcast by focusing on Spanish issues.

---

<sup>61</sup> Engstrand, 72.

<sup>62</sup> “Lois Fortune’s Report on Barrio Sésamo Production,” undated; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo-Correspondence, 1977-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

Production of the pilot commenced in late September 1978 once all pre-production issues resolved. However, tension continued between TVE and CTW over three issues. One of the problems was the hierarchy of TVE. The political situation of Spain saw several changes occur to the major decision makers in the television division. Though some had years of experience, many were new to their current positions, or some received their jobs through nepotism. For example, Marino Peña, the Director of Children's Programs, was the brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior, and had no interest in children's programming or co-productions with the United States. A second issue was the Spanish crew. Blanca Álvarez was the show's original producer, but she resigned, and José Manuel Fernández took over the show. Nicanor stayed on as director and made it clear that he did not care about the educational goals. He believed the technical aspects were more important. Nicanor explained, "I respect research, although I do not trust them."<sup>63</sup> Producer Lois Fortune highlighted the lack of enthusiasm among the crew and posited that the reason was threefold: "the general work pace in Spain is considered to be slower and less pressurized," the difficulties of labor unions, and crew members idled awaiting orders from the director.<sup>64</sup> The third issue was the scripts, which according to Fortune misunderstood the mix of education and entertainment. Instead of warm characters to support the children, the characters had "anger, hostility, and conflict" with the kids, and "rather than providing a resolution to the conflict, the conflicts became the resolution."<sup>65</sup> Another script discussed how one can become frustrated while working on a task, and showed the actor abandoning the task without solving the problem. Álvarez

---

<sup>63</sup> Lois Fortune, "Barrio Sésamo Production Trip: Pilot Production, September 20-30, 1978," October 31, 1978; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo-Correspondence, 1977-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

provided a rationale by explaining “well, that is the way life is; children do get yelled at; life is ironic.”<sup>66</sup>

Cultural differences continued to be a clash between CTW and TVE during the pilot production. CTW expressed concern over one of the sets TVE designed for the pilot—a tavern. TVE explained that a tavern “is a typical after work hang-out/get together for adults and children in Spain.”<sup>67</sup> CTW dismissed the producer’s claim this was a Spanish cultural norm, and forced the producer to read an article on alcoholism and change the tavern to a café. Another issue was the use of art on the show. TVE intended to highlight Spain’s rich history of artists, but CTW objected to the paintings chosen. Often, CTW disapproved of the choices because it consisted of subject matter deemed too sophisticated or inappropriate for young children such as death, nudity, and faith. Fortune complained that the paintings/sculptures on the show “seemed more dependent upon the greatness of the artist/painting than the appropriateness for children.”<sup>68</sup> For example, the pilot showed children reacting to Francisco Goya’s *La maja desnuda*, a portrait of a nude woman that hangs in the Prado. CTW believed the children in the film “are at the age when nudity is embarrassing,” and because the children giggle throughout the segment it makes it difficult for the audience to develop “an appreciation of the human body.”<sup>69</sup> One more issue with the *Barrio Sésamo* production was the use of negative modelling. This concept argues that children learn through imitating others and are liable to imitate both good and bad behaviors. CTW research discussed three reasons for focusing on positive modelling:

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> “Lois Fortune’s Report on Barrio Sésamo Production.”

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

[I]t can be dangerous to try to show children activities that we wish them to avoid. It is far safer to avoid portraying negative behaviors on television and concentrate on creating strong, attractive images of positive alternative behaviors. . . . Another danger of showing children negative behaviors is that the portrayal may give them ideas they had not previously considered (e.g., playing with matches, name-calling). . . . In addition, it is important to note that even the benefit of modelling a positive behavior can be erased if the message is not kept carefully consistent.<sup>70</sup>

For *Barrio Sésamo*, CTW alluded to a few potential scenes of negative modelling. One example included children “playing doctor” intercut with an examination of a child by an actual doctor. However, the beginning featured the make-believe patient being “carried to the park bench by the other children (potentially a dangerous act) and the patient is wailing dramatically.”<sup>71</sup> CTW considered the scene potentially damaging to children. The fear was they could forever associate the frightening screams with doctor visits, and children may try to lift/carry other children, which would lead to potential injuries.

Though the pilot for *Barrio Sésamo* received generally positive reviews within CTW, there were still issues of whether the children would comprehend certain segments. One piece was about the birth of an Andalusian colt. While the birth, walking, and feeding of the colt received positive reviews for showing all aspects of natural environments, there was fear it would raise more questions than answers. CTW explained that “the mounting scene at the beginning is probably not sufficient explanation of conception, and it is doubtful that it will be connected to the birth scene.”<sup>72</sup> In addition, CTW producers continued to believe the segment with *La maja desnuda* presents “more mockery than appreciation.”<sup>73</sup> After production finished on the pilot, Fernandez detailed

---

<sup>70</sup> “CTW International Research Notes,” Spring 1979; International-International Research Notes, October 1975-Spring 1979; box 118; Public Affairs, General Files; CTW archives; UMDL.

<sup>71</sup> “Lois Fortune’s Report on Barrio Sésamo Production.”

<sup>72</sup> Rodney Dennis to Lois Fortune, January 24, 1979; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo-Correspondence, 1977-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

that the production team hoped to shoot new episodes for three to four months and broadcast *Barrio Sésamo* by October 1979 with three episodes per week.

Following the disagreements over the pilot production, CTW insisted on hosting a seminar on the production process for *Barrio Sésamo*. Cast and crew examined how other co-productions work with CTW at this seminar, and it provided a venue to voice their concerns. For the writers, their major recommendation was a change to the writing style. The process of writing the episodes included writers composing isolated segments, and a show coordinator mixing the segments together, which caused issues of continuity and pacing. CTW explained having writers' design shows prior can solve this and writers should be familiar with all insert material, "both CTW's and that produced by *Barrio Sésamo*."<sup>74</sup> In addition, the seminar included an explanation for the reduction of the curriculum. The suggestions for the curriculum discussed "to begin slowly with the difficult, delicate, and controversial topics; to assess the CTW material in light of a specific curriculum and to produce in Spain the curriculum segments not covered by the CTW curriculum; a smaller curriculum is more workable and will be more likely to be successfully managed by the writers, etc."<sup>75</sup>

The qualms that CTW had with *Barrio Sésamo*'s pilot production illustrate key cultural misunderstandings of Americans on Spanish society. The tavern set, *La maja desnuda*, and the birth of the cold show CTW using American naivete and projecting it towards a Spanish audience. The objection of having the set be a tavern ignores the bars in Spain—especially tapas bars—serve more than just alcohol and are a major social gathering site for Spaniards of all ages. The use of Goya's *La maja desnuda* was another

---

<sup>74</sup> Lois Fortune to Lu Horne, November 16, 1979; Spain: Abrete Sesamo/Barrio Sesamo–Correspondence, 1977-1979; box 369; International Series, Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; CTW archives; UMDL.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

objection by CTW for fear that Spanish children would not be emotionally mature enough to understand the piece. Yet, the U.S. NGO did not consider that Goya is one of Spain's greatest artists, and that the creators of the program wanted to establish a sense of pride among youths in Spanish arts, regardless of the subject matter. The Spanish transition began doing away with censorship after a government decree by Suárez in 1977, which meant that TVE could choose whatever painting it wanted. Finally, CTW objected to parts of the segment of the Andalusian colt's birth. What CTW failed to understand was that the Andalusian horse is the breed most associated with Spain. While providing the view with a lesson on the life cycle, the segment also provided children with an understanding of the horse to the Spanish nation.

Though the original run of *Barrio Sésamo* appeared to be a critical favorite, the behind the scenes drama between TVE and CTW was too much. TVE cancelled the first run of the show in 1981 due to issues with the director, Nicanor. The general director of RTVE, José María Calviño, appointed Nicanor to the head of the new second channel of TVE as he underwent audit by the company. The director and fellow screenwriter, Dolores Salvador Maldonado, registered their names for one of the puppets created for *Barrio Sésamo*, which violated the agreement with CTW. The audit affirmed that the designs of Caponata the hen and Perezgil the snail were “the definitive designs ... [and] work of” CTW.<sup>76</sup> Nicanor and Salvador used TVE expenses to pay for the registration, and in 1979 ceded their rights to TVE for “35% of the income” for the commercialization of the dolls.<sup>77</sup> The series was cancelled by RTVE, the characters of Caponata and Perezgil removed from further television appearance, and *Sesame Street* sketches only

---

<sup>76</sup> “El Nuevo director de la segunda cadena, acusado de suspestas irregularidades,” *El País*, October 21, 1983.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*



appeared sporadically. *Barrio Sésamo* reappeared in 1982 after TVE and CTW settled their dispute. It featured new puppets by CTW and Spanish characters, which are the ones most associated with the show.

While *Barrio Sésamo* was put on hold in 1980, CTW and TVE worked together to prepare another educational television program—*3-2-1 Contacto*. Based on the U.S. version of *3-2-1 Contact*, the program aimed to provide older children with scientific education. According to a course prepared by CTW for a Spanish workshop, the objectives of the show were “to entertain all Spanish children between 10 and 14 years old; bringing them close to the world of science and technology as one of the fundamental components of our culture; that, at a fundamentally intuitive level, they include certain basic phenomena related to science and technology, their mechanisms and reasons.”<sup>78</sup> The show occurred contemporaneously with the United States emphasis in science and technology exchange programs. The new Spain wanted to emphasize science and technology as well. The show aired from 1982 to 1983 as seventy-eight half-hour programs with a Spanish cast and crew responsible for half the production. TVE aired three programs a week for twenty-six weeks. The writers relied on a group of advisors that consisted of an engineer, a scientist, and a specialist in child development. Program Director Maria Gustafson explained that the scientific advisor for “studio activities” and a chemistry specialist developed the studio segments, and the child development specialist “made sure the program’s content and language were not pitched too high for children’s

---

<sup>78</sup> José Saras Bescos, “3-2-1 Contacto: Curso Para Presentadores,” January 1981; Spain: 3-2-1 Contacto-Correspondence, 1981; box 369; Individual Country Files, 1970-1985; International Series; CTW Archives; UMDL.

understanding.”<sup>79</sup> The producers of *3-2-1 Contacto* had a much better understanding with CTW, but also this helped with development of Spanish identity.

The relationship between CTW and TVE on *3-2-1 Contacto* was cordial and did not propose as many problems as *Barrio Sésamo*’s first season. Instead, there was very little changed from the U.S. version. Gustafson explained that RTVE chose to adopt the educational goals of the U.S. series with minimal changes for Spanish teens. The focus was on “the joys and satisfaction of scientific explorations, ways of thinking in science and about social issues involving science and technology, and cooperative human endeavor and career exploration in science and technology.”<sup>80</sup> When asked how the show changed to suit Spanish children, Gustafson only highlighted the reduced episodes and changing some topics from the U.S. version. One interesting example was the change from the quintessential American sport—baseball—to another well-known American sport—basketball. The producers revised a show about baseball because “children in Spain aren’t familiar with the game,” but instead made a segment on basketball because it “is a well-known sport.”<sup>81</sup> When asked why the producers decided to just reuse CTW’s programs, Gustafson reveals that they wanted to provide more studio experiments so viewers could imitate it at home.

Television played an important aspect of the Spanish transition to democracy and U.S. soft power in Spain. Television provided USIA with a new method for soft power. The United States could use television to allow for direct access to a foreign audience while at the same time getting as wide of coverage as possible. Though newspapers and radio still proved popular among Spaniards for news, the United States could not be the

---

<sup>79</sup> Interview with Gustafson.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

major factor for foreign news in those mediums. Therefore, the move to television provided the United States with an avenue to provide soft power. The news programs, documentaries, and entertainment allowed for the United States to interact with a wider audience beyond those who strictly used the press and radio. Similarly, Spain used television as a venue to establish a national identity. The liberalization of public and regional television stations, the response to 23-F, and the Spanish arguments presented to CTW show that Spaniards looked to television to form a national identity.

CTW's work on *Barrio Sésamo* illustrates that NGOs can have an impact in the development of soft power, but also demonstrates that they can endanger these goals as well. CTW provided TVE with an educational program that came with a rich history and an opportunity to enhance the ongoing educational reform. However, CTW's lack of cultural understanding of the situation in Spain nearly derailed the show before airing the first season. Further, the Spanish crew looked to promote Spanish culture and society in the curriculum, but CTW insisted on the showing following the process laid out by previous co-productions. This lack of understanding and unwillingness to change caused a rift between CTW and TVE that nearly ended the partnership before the children watched the show. Once the show aired and proved popular, CTW became more than willing to work with TVE on other shows to integrate more Spanish identity into the final product.

## CHAPTER 6

### “A nightmare of noise without movement”<sup>1</sup>: Human Rights and Soft Power

The 1966-67 academic year in Spain witnessed a growth in student unrest and resistance performed by Spanish and American students. Spanish students demonstrated as part of the Democratic Student Syndicate in Barcelona, engaged in clashes with police in Madrid, and participated in other protest activities occurred in Bilbao, Valencia, and Seville.<sup>2</sup> Students protested U.S. support of Franco, U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and civil rights issues in Spain and abroad. On May 4, 1967, Spain expelled three American students—Karen Winn, Roberta Alexander, and Carol Watanabe—to the border between Spain and France. Spanish authorities became aware of a letter published in the Paris *New York Herald Tribune-Washington Post* where the students “criticized Spanish police handling of student demonstrators, pointed out alleged inaccuracies in Spanish press coverage of demonstrations, and took a stand in favor of student activists.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> George Orwell, *Homage to Catalonia* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1952), 131.

<sup>2</sup> “Comments on the Spanish Student Scene,” July 26, 1967; EDX 2 General Reports and Statistics, Spain, 1968; box 240; Individual Countries; Western Europe; Country Files; CU; UAL.

<sup>3</sup> “Spain Expels Three American Students,” May 20, 1967; EDX 2 General Reports and Statistics, Spain, 1968; box 240; Individual Countries; Western Europe; Country Files; CU; UAL.

Further, the Spanish press, particularly the paper of the Falange *Arriba*, accused the American students of various other issues. Alexander faced allegations of speaking at an illegal student meeting about her struggles in the United States as an African American and likened the Vietnam War to the Spanish Civil War. At the same meeting, Winn led a march of several hundred students where U.S. flags were burned. Watanabe met charges as “part of a group attempting to demonstrate in defiance of Spanish government orders.”<sup>4</sup> In a report assessing the academic year, U.S. Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke believed these protests from Spanish and American students were a “phase,” but they jeopardized American standing and goals in Spain.<sup>5</sup> This disregard of student demonstrations for political rights is the essence of how the United States approached human rights in Spain. The fears of losing U.S. interests, more so defensive than cultural, took precedent over pushing the Franco regime and newly democratic Spain towards human rights.

The Spanish transition to democracy coincided with a rise in concerns over global human rights in the 1970s. This ascent made it difficult for the United States in approaching Spain. Diplomacy with Franco caused some outrage within the United States, particularly among human rights NGOs. The presidents who monitored the political evolution in Spain often heard from organizations like Amnesty International (AI) regarding the human rights abuses of the Franco regime and early transition years. Yet, they often ignored this research in favor of keeping control of the military bases. Specifically, the Nixon and Ford administrations pursued loopholes in Congressional acts to find ways to maintain control of military bases in Spain.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> “Comments on the Spanish Student Scene,” July 26, 1967.

Examining the United States and the Spanish transition to democracy provides a way to consider how human rights as well as NGOs impact U.S. soft power. Joseph Nye explains that human rights “can be a powerful source of attraction,” but the nation using human rights as soft power must adhere to the political values it proclaims.<sup>6</sup> Further, the topic of human rights illustrates the importance of NGOs in foreign policy and power relations. Nye claims that nonprofit institutions “can complicate and obstruct government efforts,” but can assist in the development of soft power if the United States incorporates the NGOs objectives.<sup>7</sup> For example, the Carter administration attempted to implement ideas from NGOs into their human rights rhetoric, but did not enforce any sanctions in Spain even after evidence of human rights abuses. Human rights are a helpful paradigm to apply how each presidential administration offered a different power relation to Spain, and to investigate how government organizations and NGOs competed through soft power. For example, the Reagan administration did not force human rights in discussions with Spain, but Amnesty International USA helped build soft power through writing campaigns to Spanish government officials.

### **Nixon and the Franco Regime**

The Nixon presidency witnessed protest movements and calls for national and supranational action in human rights. Nixon and Kissinger placed national security interests over human rights even as the 1970s progressed and calls for civil liberties grew.<sup>8</sup> This is best illustrated in their similar demands from Greece and Spain. In the case of Greece, the United States chose to maintain the relationship with the NATO ally despite being under military rule. The Nixon administration prioritized defensive strength

---

<sup>6</sup> Nye, *Soft Power*, 55.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>8</sup> Sargent, *A Superpower Transformed*, 95.

with the military junta, and then underwent a process to “slowly prod” Greece into a return to democracy. This contrasted with some members of Congress who proposed suspending aid to Greece to imply that democracy and human rights were as important to the United States and defense.<sup>9</sup> The Nixonian approach to Greece similarly plays out with Spain. The administration absolved the Franco regime of human rights abuses to guard their rights to the bases.

The mistreatment of human rights issues brought to the attention of the United States included capital punishment, political prisoners, and torture. The first major human rights case that occurred during the Nixon administration was the Burgos Trial. This trial was a single spoke in a larger wheel of Spanish, especially Basque, citizens who were tried for political offenses. During a December 1970 trial, sixteen members of the Basque nationalist group ETA faced accusations of murdering three people. The accusations against ETA were not new; however, the length of the Burgos trial stood out as being the longest ever held during the Franco dictatorship.<sup>10</sup> Paul Preston describes the “clumsiness” of how the Spanish courts that conducted the legal proceeding turned it “into a trial of the regime itself both by the ETA defendants and by the world’s press.”<sup>11</sup> The sixteen members of ETA received death sentences, which sparked outrage both at home and abroad.

In Spain, the reaction to the Burgos trial split the societal and political atmospheres. First, those who lived in the Basque region believed the Franco regime used the trial to intimidate the region. Carlos Iglesias Selgas, the Inspector General of the

---

<sup>9</sup> Snyder, *From Selma to Moscow*, 77-80; Michael Cotey Morgan, “The Seventies and the Rebirth of Human Rights,” in *Reasserting America in the 1970s*, 245.

<sup>10</sup> Preston, *Triumph of Democracy*, 27-30

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

Spanish Syndical Organization, expressed to an American labor officer at the U.S. embassy that “except for the Basque provinces where the issue of Basque separatism is a highly emotionally charged one” he did not anticipate actions on a national level.<sup>12</sup> Second, there was concern over the role of the Spanish Armed Forces in the trial. In a conversation with an American embassy official, the Director General of the Bank of Spain Angel Madroñero described how the Spanish Armed Forces were forced to give death sentences because they “believed that they are being used by the Government and that the civilian authorities will try to win public favor at the expense of the military by commuting the death sentences.”<sup>13</sup> This is further confirmed in an NSC memorandum that details the Spanish domestic scene:

The military, who are responsible for law and order in the country, were disturbed because the trial was in a military court, and in view of the military's responsibility for domestic security, they were compelled to issue death sentences against those Basques implicated in the murder of a policeman. At the same time, they realized that if Franco commuted the sentences, the image of the military would suffer. They pressed for execution in order that their civilian colleagues in the Government who had to approve the death sentences should share in the blame.<sup>14</sup>

Finally, there were those who had faith the Franco regime would show clemency. Ex-Foreign Minister Alberto Martín Artaio illustrated that the trials manifested support for the Franco Government and “shown the world that Spaniards supported their leadership.”<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Carlos Iglesias Selgas and John B. Gwynn, December 14, 1970; POL 12 - Burgos Trial Spain 1970-1971; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>13</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Angel Madroñero and Stephen W. Bosworth, December 16, 1970; POL 12 - Burgos Trial Spain 1970-1971; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>14</sup> “The Juan Carlos Visit: Perspectives,” January 22, 1971; Spain Prince Juan Carlos Visit Jan 1971; box 938; VIP Visits, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>15</sup> Memorandum of Conversation between Alberto Martín Artaio and Curtis C. Cutter, December 18, 1970; POL 12 - Burgos Trial Spain 1970-1971; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.



While there was a plurality of opinions in Spain, the global response to the Burgos trial was unanimous shock and anger. Thirteen governments, Pope Paul VI, and Spanish bishops argued for the commutation of the sentences.<sup>16</sup> Though foreign opinion was against the sentencing, some within Spain did not appreciate the foreign outrage. Madroñero claimed the foreign press coverage of the trials had been “disgraceful” because they romanticized ETA and did not cover them as a terrorist organization.<sup>17</sup> Yet, the outcry from within and outside of Spain was too much. The Franco regime reduced the sentences from death to imprisonment. There were two reasons Franco granted clemency: both the cabinet and Council of the Realm opposed the executions and the exhortation from foreign leaders for clemency.<sup>18</sup> This campaign over human rights in Spain made an impact over the next decade. As Stanley Payne explains the Burgos trial placed the Basques and ETA in the global eye, “and the general outpouring of international sympathy and appeals on their behalf—all had a profound effect.”<sup>19</sup> However, one country remained silent throughout the ordeal: the United States.

While the Franco regime received pleas for commutation of the death sentences in the Burgos trial, the United States remained silent. In a letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, both Ambassador Hill and Assistant Secretary of State Hillenbrand strongly recommended the United States not respond to the sentencing as it would not alleviate American standing nor the defendants, and it would endanger the ongoing negotiations for the bases. Hill highlights two problems with condemning the sentencing.

---

<sup>16</sup> Alba, 234-5.

<sup>17</sup> Conversation between Madroñero and Bosworth, RG 59; NARA.

<sup>18</sup> Memorandum of Conversations between Emilio Romero Gomez, R.N. Allen, and John B. Gwynn, January 7, 1971; POL 12 - Burgos Trial Spain 1970-1971; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>19</sup> Stanley G. Payne, *The Franco Regime, 1936-1975* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 560.

First, the Spanish domestic situation was too delicate because the nation split between those who endorsed executions and those who advocated for clemency. There were not only divisions within the Spanish public, but within the government as well. Carrero Blanco and the military led those in favor of executions, and those in favor of clemency were with Foreign Minister López-Bravo and Spanish civilians. Hill explained that López-Bravo's attempt to make closer contact with the West would "go down the drain if the death sentences are carried out."<sup>20</sup> Second, if the United States remained silent on the issue, it faced criticism at home "as practically the only major free world country which has not made a statement."<sup>21</sup> Hill advised the administration to avoid making any decision on the trial. Once again, the priority of the Spanish bases played a key decision in U.S.-Spain relations.

Nixon considered abandoning his silence on the Burgos trial when he received word that Edward Kennedy had reached out to Franco. Deputy National Security Advisor Alexander Haig wrote to Nixon explaining that Hill received information that Kennedy cabled Franco to urge clemency for those involved in the Burgos trial. Further, Kennedy later cabled a congratulations after the decision of leniency "with the view toward releasing the exchange both in Spain and in the U.S. for political benefit."<sup>22</sup> When asked whether the Nixon administration should step in with an announcement of their own, Hill continued his stance that it would be a disaster for both the United States and Spain. The ambassador further clarified that "whatever temporary benefit Kennedy may appear to acquire from his public antics, the long term good achieved by [Nixon] handing of the

---

<sup>20</sup> Martin Hillenbrand to William Rogers, undated; POL 12 - Burgos Trial Spain 1970-1971; box 11; Records Relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> To Nixon from Haig, December 30, 1970; Spain Vol 3 Aug 1970-31 Dec 1971 (2); box 705; Country Files - Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

matter will undoubtedly prevail.”<sup>23</sup> Even domestic politics would not change the Nixon administration’s mind that security interests remained first in U.S.-Spain bilateral relations.

The choice to remain neutral on the Burgos trial did not affect U.S.-Spain diplomacy, but it did show that the United States placed American security over human rights. In a conversation shortly after the commutation of the sentences, Nixon expressed pleasure to Juan Carlos and Spanish Ambassador Jaime Arguelles of the trial outcome. Nixon noticed that Juan Carlos appeared “somewhat nervous about discussing the trials” and relied on Arguelles to respond.<sup>24</sup> Nixon explained that “the wisdom of the Burgos decision” was correct and “considerable pressure had been brought to bear on him to speak out,” but refused to do so because it was “an internal matter.”<sup>25</sup> Juan Carlos and Arguelles thanked Nixon for his decision and attitude, and explained they were not nervous about the nationalist separatists but the terrorists in the region. The aftermath of the Burgos trial put a damper on the *apertura*. In a report before he left his post, Ambassador Hill wrote about the fallout of the Burgos trial. He explained that the events caused the Franco regime to “harden its attitude toward political liberalization” with rejection of political parties, silencing dissenting press, and political appointments from the bunker.<sup>26</sup> The Franco regime tightened its grip over Spain while the United States abided by silence on human rights.

While the Burgos trial represented a major human rights issue, AI produced a wealth of reports that highlighted the problem of political prisoners in Spain. As historian

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> *FRUS, 1969-1976, Volume XLI*, Doc. 302.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> “Impressions of Spanish Trends and Developments,” Robert C. Hill, January 12, 1972; Spain vol 4 Jan 1972-Jun 1974 (1); box 706; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

Tom Buchanan explains, AI owed much of its development “to long-term concern over the human rights abuses of the Franco regime.”<sup>27</sup> In the Annual Report for 1971-1972, AI groups around Spain worked with over 350 prisoners that included communists, socialists, Basque nationalists, and conscientious objectors. In addition, the Franco government imprisoned unionists, students, journalists, priests, lawyers, and teachers who criticized the regime’s views of unions, strikes, the new education laws, or protests.<sup>28</sup> In another publicized report, AI supplied a historical precedent for political imprisonment in Spain. According to this report, at the entrance of almost all Spanish prisons is a quote attributed to Franco: “I can affirm without fear of error that anyone who has visited the prisons of other countries and compared them with ours will not have found institutions as equitable, Christian or humane as those established by our movement.”<sup>29</sup> Though AI included in its public discourse the violations of Spanish political prisoners, the Nixon administration was not inclined to include human rights in U.S.-Spain relations.

AI was not the only NGO to question human rights in U.S.-Spain relations. The U.S. section of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) condemned the United States’ use of Wargames maneuvers in Spain. In 1969, the State Department confirmed that U.S. forces conducted maneuvers to practice suppressing a rebellion against the Franco regime. This was the second time in two years the exercises occurred, and they focused “not at defending against an outside attack but at repelling

---

<sup>27</sup> Tom Buchanan, “How ‘Different’ Was Spain? The Later Franco Regime in International Context” in *Spain Transformed: The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959-75* ed. Nigel Townson (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 89.

<sup>28</sup> Amnesty International Annual Report, 1971-1972, undated; Spain: Political Prisoners I; box 175; Administrative Files; New York Office; Spanish Refugee Aid Records; NYUL.

<sup>29</sup> Amnesty International, *Political Imprisonment in Spain* (London: Amnesty International Publications, 1973), 4.

internal insurrection.”<sup>30</sup> This illustrated that the United States was willing to keep an authoritarian dictator in place because it meant they could control those in charge of negotiating the rights to the bases. The WILPF condemned the U.S. government—particularly the State Department—for their role in the Wargames maneuvers during the annual meeting in Atlanta that year. They resolved that the organization was “deeply concerned,” and these actions “shows that establishment of U.S. military bases within a foreign nation ... leads to military action within that nation.”<sup>31</sup> In addition, the WILPF pointed to the ethical hypocrisy of the United States in Spain, and the summation of Nixonian human rights policy: “Not only is it morally indefensible for the United States to give aid to this or any other dictatorial regime; it is also another disquieting example of the United States military determination of our government’s foreign policy.”<sup>32</sup> The response to the Burgos trial and ignoring of NGO reports and claims illustrated security and the bases took precedent.

The Nixon administration’s choice to remain neutral on the Burgos trial shows that the United States planned to place security interests over human rights. The argument used by the administration was that if Washington called for clemency for those in the trial that it would anger Franco and jeopardize base negotiations. Yet, this would have made no difference as one of the factors given for clemency was the pressure from foreign governments. The Nixon administration could have easily joined this group in calling for removal of the death penalty. Though the country was split, the United States could have gained soft power with the Spanish public by promoting human rights.

---

<sup>30</sup> Telegram, June 17, 1969; Spain vol 1 thru Feb. 1970 (1); box 704; Country Files – Europe, NSC Files; RNL.

<sup>31</sup> “Resolution on Spain,” July 25, 1969; GEN CO 139 Spain [1969-1970]; box 67; WHCF CO; RNL.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

Instead, the Nixon administration ignored the situation and those NGOs who provided evidence of discrepancies under the Franco regime.

### **Ford and the Transition to Democracy**

Though the Burgos trial was the major human rights issue of the Nixon presidency, the Ford administration began to see the impact of human rights and human rights organizations on foreign policy. The United States faced great pressure to address human rights abuses in Spain. As Counselor for Political Affairs David E. Simcox explains, the United States “had pretty much refrained from questioning Franco’s behavior internally,” and both domestic and foreign calls were made for the Ford administration to tackle these concerns.<sup>33</sup> One of the first examples of this is a report of Donald Fraser’s Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements in 1974. This report “urged that the United States make the promotion of human rights a major foreign policy goal and recommended a variety of actions to promote that goal.”<sup>34</sup> The Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, an amendment of the original 1961 act, solidified this with an added segment. Section 502B required the president to advise Congress if they reached a security deal with a group accused of human rights abuses. This was the first-time human rights could cost the United States control over the Spanish bases. However, the Ford administration echoed Nixon’s approach to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

In a departmental memorandum from March 1975, the State Department quoted human rights NGOs as in possession of research on various human rights violations in Spain. For example, AI presented charges that “Spain violates the rights of assembly, expression and association, rights recognized internationally in such documents as

---

<sup>33</sup> Interview with David E. Simcox, August 26, 1993, Frontline Diplomacy, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

<sup>34</sup> Huntington, 91.

Articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”<sup>35</sup> In addition, the memorandum concentrates on allegations of torture used in police departments. One accusation included how “persons convicted of ‘political’ offenses are subjected to discriminatory and abusive treatment in prison, including arbitrary enforcement of prison regulations to increase their degradation and demoralization, and depriving political prisoners of most of their rights to remission and conditional liberty.”<sup>36</sup>

The State Department memorandum argued that some may perceive AI’s research as damning, but the wording of Section 502B offered a loophole for the Ford administration. This is like the Nixon administration’s use of a loophole for Section 620(m). According to the State Department, 502B “provides only that the Congress be advised of those extraordinary circumstances in the Spanish case, it is open to the Executive Branch, without reaching a determination of the characterization to be applied to the human rights performance of the Spanish government, to advise Congress of those circumstances which would necessitate the assistance even if the government of Spain were deemed to fall within the terms of Section 502B.”<sup>37</sup> The extraordinary circumstances that *necessitated* security assistance was the retention of the military bases and the fallout of terminating base rights. This loophole illustrates—just as the Burgos trial did—that control of the bases took precedent.

The Ford administration applied the loophole of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 in making their conclusion on human rights in Spain. If the United States were to remove themselves from Spain, it would endanger the possible advancement of human

---

<sup>35</sup> Human Rights in Spain: 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, March 13, 1974; Human Rights 1975; box 15; Records relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

rights in the country and be detrimental to keeping defensive interests. After discussing the technicality, the administration began outlining how they planned to endorse human rights during the transition to democracy. The United States made it clear that they supported Spain and believed that democracy would usher an advancement of human rights. In addition, the administration made the argument that the non-military assistance they provided from the 1970 agreement contributed “to the strengthening [of] academic and scientific ties between the two countries and thus fosters greater awareness and, perhaps, interest in human rights within influential sectors of Spanish society.”<sup>38</sup> However, an event a few months later tested the United States’ sudden commitment to advancing human rights in Spain.

In late August 1975, the Franco government passed a new anti-terrorist law. The first three articles of the law detailed how those suspected of terrorism faced trial in military tribunals, and if found guilty faced the death penalty. Amnesty International USA (AIUSA) performed assiduous research of the anti-terrorism law and found copious issues with it. Frances González of the U.S. Committee for a Democratic Spain provided AIUSA with a translation and summary of the anti-terrorism law. According to Article 10 of the law, any person “in opposition to the regime and who voices that opposition comes under this law,” and that no patriotic citizen “should feel threatened by this law and declares that the restriction of the Spanish people’s constitutional rights is a small sacrifice for tranquility and security.”<sup>39</sup> Another article in the law, Article 18, defines how the Franco regime tried to control activities of lawyers defending political prisoners

---

<sup>38</sup> Spain: Human Rights, April 17, 1975; Human Rights 1975; box 15; Records relating to Spain, 1963-1976; RG 59; NARA.

<sup>39</sup> Frances Gonzalez to Sarah Foote, September 15, 1975; folder: 1975; box 9; National Section Memos, 1964-1983; Executive Director's Files, 1964-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.



by having a court appointed third defense lawyer. Other aspects of the anti-terrorism law detail the inimical restrictions on mass media, public officials, and authorities who voiced opposition to the Franco cabinet, which González suggests “demonstrates the regime’s fear of disagreement within the ranks of the public authority itself.”<sup>40</sup> While there were many facets of this law, its use in the following weeks would cause a human rights crisis.

In September, several trials provoked an application of the new anti-terrorism law. Members of ETA and the Revolutionary Antifascist Patriotic Front (FRAP)<sup>41</sup> faced military tribunals for their accused crimes. For example, one of the trials centered around five members of FRAP who faced accusations of murdering a policeman in Madrid. The five were Manuel Blanco Chivetes, José Humberto Baena Alonso, Fernando Sierra Marco, Pablo Mayoral Rueda, and Vladimir Fernández Tovar. AIUSA quickly put together an “urgent action” campaign for the five, which sent telegrams to foreign governments to stop abuses.<sup>42</sup> A sample telegram meant for Franco and the U.S. State Department included:

Believing capital punishment violates right to life and right not to be subjected to inhuman punishment, we request on humanitarian grounds that death sentences not be passed in the military court trial of Manuel Blanco Chivetes, Jose Humberto Baena Alonso, Fernando Sierra Marco, Pablo Mayoral Rueda, Vladimir Fernandex (sic.) Tovar.<sup>43</sup>

The five FRAP members faced conviction on September 17 under the anti-terrorism law, which meant they could be executed within hours of the death penalty pronouncement. A week later, these five—along with other convicted FRAP and ETA members—faced Franco and the Council of Ministers. They commuted the death sentences of six but

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Spanish name is Frente Revolucionario Antifascista y Patriota.

<sup>42</sup> Keys, 184.

<sup>43</sup> To Sarah Foote, August 30, 1975; folder: 1975; box 9; National Section Memos, 1964-1983; Executive Director's Files, 1964-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

confirmed the death penalty for five, including Jose Humberto Baena Alonso, and the executions followed the next day. Outrage occurred around the world. Mexico cut communications with the Franco government. However, the strongest response came from Europe when twelve European governments removed their ambassadors, and the EEC suspended their negotiations with Spain for a trade treaty. This was the first time “both the governments of Western Europe and the European institutions agreed unanimously to express their rejection of Franco’s policy and they used all mechanisms in order to make it effective.”<sup>44</sup> In foreseeable fashion, the United States remained silent on the anti-terrorism law and executions in order to maintain the status quo with Spain. Yet, this would soon fall out of practice on November 20, 1975.

Franco became ill and died shortly after the ETA and FRAP executions, which plunged Spain and the United States into uncertainty about the post-Franco era. The Ford administration appreciated the restoration of the monarchy in Spain with Juan Carlos. There were hopes that Juan Carlos would be a champion of democracy and, by proxy, human rights. This optimism heightened following a pardon decree for certain prisoners. According to the pronouncement, most criminals received a minimum reduction of their sentence by no less than three years, and those with sentences under three years were voided.<sup>45</sup> However, the requisites for a pardon contained quite a few caveats. For example, those crimes “that come within the purview of the Anti-Terrorism Law including propaganda or membership in proscribed groups” did not receive a pardon.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Alba, , 244; Powell, “Spain’s External Relations 1898-1975” in *Democratic Spain*), 28; Crespo MacLennan, , 114.

<sup>45</sup> “King Decrees General Pardon (Indulto) and Bestows Titles on Franco’s Wife and Daughter,” November 26, 1975; Spain Trip Message File, 1975; box 3; Nelson Rockefeller Vice Presidential Records; Series 19: Foreign Affairs and National Security; RAC.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

This included ETA and FRAP members as well as other separatist groups such as communists and anarchists. Juan Carlos bestowed patents of nobility to Franco's wife and daughter alongside the pardon decree. Even when making strides, the Franco legacy handicapped the progress that the Spanish king made in human rights.

The apprehension of the American public was high when Juan Carlos ascended to the throne in Spain. This is especially evident in the creation of the American committees that formed to promote democracy and human rights in Spain. These organizations were discussed earlier in the dissertation—the Ad Hoc Committee for a Democratic Spain, the Madison Committee for a Democratic Spain, the U.S. Committee for a Democratic Spain, and the American Committee for Iberian Freedom. While these organizations fought for human rights alongside AIUSA, Juan Carlos returned to Spain after his official state visit in 1976 and a few months later, addressed the issue of political prisoners. On August 4, Juan Carlos issued a royal decree permitting partial amnesty for political prisoners who did not commit violent crimes. However, AI raised concerns regarding the royal decree. They worried that prisoners of conscience—those imprisoned because they did not share the views of the regime—may not be classified as a prisoner who received amnesty. Further, the AI research department argued that “gross violations of correct trial procedure” occurred during the Franco regime, which led to wrongful convictions of prisoners of conscience as violent offenders.<sup>47</sup> Therefore, prisoners of conscience may not be among those released or considered for amnesty. The United States appeared content with the decree, regardless of AI pointing to the loophole.

---

<sup>47</sup> Report on the Amnesty for Political Prisoners in Spain, September 3, 1976; folder: 1976; box 9; National Section Memos, 1964-1983; Executive Director's Files, 1964-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

The Ford administration praised the release of more than 6,500 prisoners within one week of Franco's death, and applauded Juan Carlos's decree of full amnesty for nonviolent prisoners for their release of 308 prisoners within a few months.<sup>48</sup> In addition, the administration criticized AI's 1974-1975 report on human rights problems in Spain. They argued that AI's reports on Spain were "issued prior to the death of Franco and the institution of the new government. In July, [AI] took note without comment of the new government's recent amnesty decree."<sup>49</sup> The United States government dismissed the calls for continued human rights investigations in Spain because AI did not have an up-to-date report or comment, even though the NGO researched and raised serious concerns for prisoners of conscience.

The Ford administration continued the policies of the United States to not upset the status quo and accepted the bare minimum from Spain. The Spanish transition to democracy represented a prime opportunity to build soft power via human rights. However, the Ford administration fell into traps of the Nixon era by focusing on maintaining the status quo of U.S.-Spain defensive relations. This is seen through the search of loopholes in Congress to maintain control of the Spanish bases. Further, Ford ignored the concerns of NGOs—from the committees that formed like the Ad Hoc Committee for a Democratic Spain and larger organizations like AI—in their early apprehension of Juan Carlos and prisoners of conscience. However, Juan Carlos's decision for amnesty of nonviolent prisoners gave the Ford administration a path towards building soft power. Ford and the United States promoted the decree as Spain moving in the right direction with human rights despite evidence that Juan Carlos could have done

---

<sup>48</sup> Human Rights – Spain, November 1976; Spain, 1976 (7) WH; box 22; NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77 - Country File; National Security Advisor; GRFL.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

more. The United States fell in with Spanish leaders in promoting the “Pact of Forgetting,” a consensus among Spaniards to move forward with democracy and leave behind the authoritarianism of Franco without transitional justice.<sup>50</sup>

### **Carter, Reagan, and NGOs during the Transition**

Human rights appeared during the 1976 presidential campaign to be “the perfect post-Vietnam, post-Cold War, recession-era antidote” to improve America’s image at home and abroad.<sup>51</sup> Though Carter made human rights his platform during the campaign, actually applying it to foreign policy was an entirely different issue. Carter believed that human rights was “a natural extension of everything that unified Americans—history, ideology, and political practice,” and expected human rights “to work in a similar way” on the world stage.<sup>52</sup> As Brzezinski describes, the Carter administration concluded that a moral vacuum appeared in international affairs and committed to a teleology of human rights. Brzezinski argues “a major emphasis on human rights as a component of U.S. foreign policy would advance America’s global interests by demonstrating to the Third World the reality of our democratic system, in sharp contrast to the political system and practices of our adversaries.”<sup>53</sup>

Armed with the belief human rights should be a foreign policy goal, Carter began investigating methods to enforce this. Director of Policy Planning Anthony Lake delineated ambitions for the Carter administration in a letter to Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Lake believed the long-range goals of the United States was to raise the standards of human rights abroad through economic, societal, and political goals.

---

<sup>50</sup> Encarnación, *Democracy Without Justice*.

<sup>51</sup> Sellars, 118-9.

<sup>52</sup> Stuckey, 42-5.

<sup>53</sup> Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Adviser, 1977-1981* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983), 124.

However, the administration should consider “most vigorous action ... with regard to crimes against the person: i.e., officially sanctioned murder, torture, or detention without fair trial.”<sup>54</sup> Further, Lake believed the United States should work closely with AI. Debates happened within the Carter administration of how human rights could negatively affect national security interests if the United States angered friendly states. An inter-agency committee met and prepared an official definition of human rights for the Carter administration. As historian Mary Stuckey points out, defining human rights was “a thorny issue, and definitions varied over time, but in general, [Carter] seemed to consider ‘human rights’ to be related to governmental respect for protection of an individual’s person, beliefs, and spiritual practices.”<sup>55</sup>

The administration knew the U.S. stand on human rights might upset certain NATO members and lead to exploitation by the Soviet Union, but they stood for reinforcing human rights in Western countries. They believed that NATO and Western Europe should make a major effort “to reinforce democratic tendencies, particularly in countries that have only recently established or reestablished democracy” like Spain.<sup>56</sup> Therefore, the Carter administration believed Spain should promote and accommodate human rights into the transition to democracy. After a year in office, Lake wrote to Vance to discuss what the United States accomplished in their human rights policy. Lake argued the most notable advances in political freedom came in Spain, which was “independent of our human rights advocacy, but democratic forces ... seem to be taking heart from our

---

<sup>54</sup> *FRUS, 1977–1980, Volume II*, Doc. 29.

<sup>55</sup> Stuckey, xxiv.

<sup>56</sup> *FRUS, 1977–1980, Volume II*, Doc. 73.

new focus.”<sup>57</sup> AI debunked this unrealistic appraisal with several reports on human rights violations.

In a report published in October 1979, AI examined whether human rights made any progress during the Spanish transition. The report explored the timeframe of 1977 to 1979 and discussed both international and domestic issues. On the international stage, AI noted that Spain did join the Council of Europe, an organization that promoted democracy, law, and human rights in Europe. The Council of Europe required Spain to pledge to the European Convention on Human Rights when it enlisted in 1977.<sup>58</sup> However, AI indicated that Spain signed but did not ratify the European Convention on Human Rights.<sup>59</sup> Domestically, AI appraised the political acts passed during this period. The report extolled Juan Carlos for his amnesties and pardons of political prisoners and the decline of torture in prisoners in the first years of the transitions. Yet, AI believed that new laws and international procedures—Law 21/1978 and Royal Decree-Law 3/1979—circumvented the strides made. These acts allowed police to detain those they suspected of being in “armed groups” and those who defend “the conduct or activities of anyone who is a member of an armed group.”<sup>60</sup> This happened particularly around the Basque and Catalan regions.

The AI report discussed the alleged torture of fourteen select victims in five different Guardia Civil stations for maltreatment and torture. AI sent a coalition to examine the victims, which consisted of two Danish doctors, a lawyer from the Federal Republic of Germany, and AI staff researchers. The doctors visited Madrid, Barcelona

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., Doc. 105.

<sup>58</sup> Story, “Spain’s External Relations Redefined: 1975-89” in *Democratic Spain*, 34.

<sup>59</sup> Amnesty International, *Report of an Amnesty International Mission to Spain, 3-28 October 1979* (London: Amnesty International Publications, 1980), 1.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 2.

and Bilbao from October 23 through 28, the lawyer visited San Sebastian, Pamplona, and Madrid, and the research staff traveled around the country throughout October. AI discovered these issues from thirteen interviews: thirteen were threatened or next-of-kin threatened, five endured mock executions, one stomached “la bañera,” eleven had mental exhaustion, eight had physical exhaustion from constant exercise, fourteen suffered maltreatment, ten subjected to “la barra,” five given electric shocks, three tormented by “la moto,” five suffered semi-suffocation, one person half strangled by mock hanging, ten stretched between two tables, two harrowed by “el quirófano,” and seven faced verbal humiliation.<sup>61</sup> The research staff found inconsistencies in two of the fourteen cases, but the doctors’ medical findings supported the allegations of maltreatment.<sup>62</sup> AI concluded the police officers mistreated and tortured the detainees, and allegations against police officers continued following the publication of the report.

The calls for human rights from NGOs began to weigh heavily on the Carter administration. In a memo to White House Counsel Robert J. Lipshutz, Samuel Huntington described “a growing and increasingly self-conscious and articulate human rights constituency, involving ... groups which are both centrally concerned with the issue, such as Freedom House or Amnesty International.”<sup>63</sup> In December 1977, Brzezinski proposed the formation of a government organization for human rights, the aptly named Human Rights Foundation. This represented Brzezinski attempting to filch NGO soft power to benefit the Carter administration in Spain.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 14-16. “La bañera” (the bathtub) was forcing victim’s head into a bathtub filled with a mixture of water, blood, vomit, excrement, and food remnants. “La barra”(the bar) was where they suspended one from their wrists on the bar. “La moto” (the motorcycle) was when one was seated on a chair, handcuffed behind back, legs brought to sides, hips and knees flexed as tightly as possible, then the legs are raised and put on chairs. “El quirófano” (the operating table) was a victim held on a table and given body blows. La barra only occurred in Bilbao, and la moto only happed in Barcelona.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 17-19.

<sup>63</sup> *FRUS, Volume II*, Doc. 81.



However, this suggestion met resistance within the administration. Mondale did not fully object to the idea but did not support it. He explained that the Human Rights Foundation would just duplicate NGOs like AI and be governmental, which meant the government “would take blame for ineffectiveness or inaction on those difficult human rights which cannot be resolved immediately.”<sup>64</sup> Brzezinski believed one of the functions the proposed foundation would do is provide financial and other types of support to NGOs. He argued against Mondale’s position by explaining that even if the Human Rights Foundation “were to do no more than increase the funds available to NGOs, it would have performed a valuable service.”<sup>65</sup> However, Brzezinski faced another challenge, this time from Vance. The Secretary of State argued that NGOs like AI already “do a great deal of information gathering,” and if the government offered them funds it “might be seen to compromise their appearance of objectivity and potentially undermine their effectiveness.”<sup>66</sup> The debate among Carter officials illustrates the needless complication of intermingling government organizations with NGOs. Both Carter and AI had the same soft power objective in mind—the improvement of human rights in Spain. However, the administration succumbed to infighting about integrating human rights because of bureaucracy and fears of compromising foreign policy.

Yet, the prominence of NGOs and their soft power made them hard to ignore. Their prestige forced the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs from the State Department—already under attack by other bureaus, departments, and the White House—to meet with several NGOs, including AI, and discuss the perceptions and

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., Doc. 97.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., Doc. 114.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., Doc. 121.

recommendations for the Carter administration.<sup>67</sup> These NGOs strongly supported Carter placing human rights on the policy agenda, but the administration's lack of enforcement against those who violated human rights disturbed them. The NGOs cited copious amounts of evidence the United States distanced themselves from human rights advocacy, but the strongest argument was "diminishing U.S. pressure on major violators."<sup>68</sup> In the case of Spain, the United States continued to struggle as bastions of human rights because of the military bases and connection to Franco.

There were several recommendations for the Carter administration to address, including a major speech from a high-level administration official, a foreign service education program on teaching human rights, and a reflection in U.S. aid patterns to democratic nations or developing democratic nations. In addition, they asked the ICA to review programs to endorse human rights concerns. One recommendation from NGOs was a request for the State Department to "inform them more quickly about changes in human rights conditions and consult them more frequently during 'the process of making a decision.'"<sup>69</sup> Though AI was one of the major NGOs to highlight the importance of human rights, the 1970s saw a flurry of major foundations providing funding for human rights activity. The Ford Foundation was one of these with the creation of the Helsinki Watch (soon to be renamed Human Rights Watch). The Ford Foundation funded educational initiatives during the Cold War, but they began to fund initiatives like

---

<sup>67</sup> Victor S. Kauffman, "The Bureau of Human Rights under the Carter Administration," *The Historian* 61 (1), 1998, 55.

<sup>68</sup> *FRUS, Volume II*, Doc. 187.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

Helsinki Watch, which grew into a dominant force in human rights during the Madrid Conference of CSCE in 1980-1983.<sup>70</sup>

Historians often point to the ideological differences between Reagan and Carter, but there is a correlation which appears—a moralistic, ideological approach to human rights and democracy abroad. Huntington attributes Reagan’s criticism of Carter’s approach to human rights to Carter’s focus on “individual human rights abuses rather than on the political systems that denied human rights.”<sup>71</sup> Reagan believed the promotion of an American style democracy was an important factor in human rights. Westad highlights that Reagan and his ideological advisors were a continuation of Brzezinski—not Kissinger’s regional policeman—with their support of any who opposed the Soviets.<sup>72</sup> In the context of the Cold War, Reagan believed that the United States was moralistic and the American political system was part of this virtuosity. Stuckey highlights how Reagan consistently argued “for the virtues of democracy over the vices of totalitarian rule” with human rights and constitutional democracy as the intersection.<sup>73</sup>

The Cold War paradigm informed the way Reagan related human rights and the Spanish transition to democracy. In a research memo from the USIA, the Reagan administration learned where the Spanish public stood on both U.S. and Soviet foreign policies, which included human rights. According to the memo, those who contributed to a survey rated the Soviet Union “negatively and divide evenly on protection of human rights in the United States.”<sup>74</sup> In head-to-head comparisons with the Soviet Union, the

---

<sup>70</sup> Stuckey, 16; Moyn, *The Last Utopia*, 172; Sellars, 139-140.

<sup>71</sup> Huntington, *The Third Wave*, 92.

<sup>72</sup> Westad, 331.

<sup>73</sup> Stuckey, 91.

<sup>74</sup> “Spanish Public Critical of Wide Range of US Policies,” January 23, 1986; Spain-1986 (7); RAC box 4; Peter Sommer Files, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

United States was considered the nation that “fosters human rights in other countries, helps poorer nations to develop, and is willing to negotiate disputes;” however, the United States is “more frequently viewed as the power that seeks world domination, uses military force to attain its goals, intervenes in the affairs of other countries, supports subversive groups and uses ‘terrorism’ to weaken other governments.”<sup>75</sup> Therefore, the administration understood the Spanish public respected the United States when it comes to human rights, but denounced the Cold War aggression of Reagan.

The parallel between Reagan and Carter on human rights is best seen through comparisons of their rhetoric. Carter used Spain to show to the world how democracy helped human rights, and Reagan emphasized the role of democracy in the stability of Spain. During his trip to Madrid in 1985, Reagan gave a few speeches and emphasized the importance of democracy in Spain. In remarks to community leaders, Reagan highlighted the growth of democracy and human rights in Spain: “We salute, too, the remarkable achievement of the people of this land. Any visitor here can see that freedom is flourishing. For democracy to succeed, its roots must grow deep and wide.”<sup>76</sup> This last sentence was a reference to the importance of Spanish democracy on Latin America. After a meeting with González, Reagan reiterated this point and emphasized the importance of how Spain’s transition to democracy impacted the globe. Finally, at a State Dinner that night, Reagan detailed the importance of human rights in the transition. He

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Remarks to Community Leaders in Madrid, May 7, 1985.  
<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/research/speeches/50785b>

explained the transition remained “ever true to the humane values at the core of representative government.”<sup>77</sup>

The Reagan administration monitored the development of human rights in Spain, specifically those that involved religious issues. These included the introduction of a divorce law and the legalization of abortion, and whether Spain had the leadership capabilities to integrate them into the new Spain. In the research for a speech on Juan Carlos and Sofía’s official visit, the administration clipped a *Washington Post* article on Spain’s legalization of divorce. The article details how the 1981 Spanish parliament, then under the control of the UCD, put forth legislation with the PSOE to allow for divorces. The caveats included that “uncontested divorce suits to be settled within two years of filing for separation and delays of up to five years for contested suits.”<sup>78</sup> The Justice Ministry expected protests from the Catholic Church immediately, but over time “the existence of divorce will be accepted by Catholics and non-Catholics alike as part of the modernity of post-Franco Spain.”<sup>79</sup> Once the PSOE took over, the Reagan administration acknowledged that they smartly controlled the pace of human rights. Specifically, the United States monitored how the Socialist government planned to legalize abortion. Gonzalez narrowly defined the grounds on when an abortion would be permitted. The Reagan administration complimented him for maintaining neutrality with conservatives, and how he “minimized the damage” with the Catholic Church.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Toast at the State Dinner in Madrid, Spain, May 7, 1985.

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/research/speeches/50785d>

<sup>78</sup> “Spain Passes Divorce Law After 40-Year Ban,” *The Washington Post*, June 24, 1981.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> “Spain: The Risks of Socialist Moderation,” June 23, 1983; Spain - 1983 (May 1983-June 1983); RAC box 6; European and Soviet Affairs Directorate Records, NSC Staff and Offices, White House Staff and Office Files; RRL.

Though Reagan illustrated the advancement of human rights in Spain, AI showed that human rights violations still occurred in Spain well into the 1980s. The largest campaign undertaken by AIUSA involved the campaign against torture. AI published a book, *Torture in the Eighties*, which examined the use of torture throughout the world. Reports on torture involving the Guardia Civil continued to appear in the report. There was evidence presented by former detainees, medical doctors, lawyers, the Catholic Church, and human rights groups on the torture occurred in Guardia Civil stations, especially in March 1983 in Bilbao. The Code of Criminal Procedure in the Constitution had safeguards for detainees, but it also permitted suspension of certain “safeguard rights” if the investigation is about “armed groups or terrorist elements.”<sup>81</sup> Further, the Organic Law 11/80 allowed those detained to be held incommunicado, denied a lawyer, offered no medical treatment, and denied right to phone their families for seventy-two hours. Between the implementation of this law in December 1980 to March 1983, AI discovered 3,205 incommunicado detentions.<sup>82</sup> Most of those detained were alleged members of ETA and tortured in order to obtain confessions or information.

AIUSA began a Campaign Against Torture (CAT), which involved writing campaigns to prominent political figures. Two such cases involved Joaquín Olano and José María Olarra. A volunteer from Washington—Martha G. Burnett—wrote a letter to Felipe González on behalf of Olano. Burnett wrote,

I am writing to you out of concern for Joaquin Olano, a mechanic from the Basque region of Spain. He was arrested last summer and held incommunicado at the Civil Guard headquarters in San Sebastian. He was admitted to a hospital after a local resident reported the sound of cries above loud music coming from the headquarters. A doctor at the San Sebastian Red Cross hospital stated that Olano had suffered a concussion and was cut and bruised on both head and body.

---

<sup>81</sup> Amnesty International, *Torture in the Eighties* (London: Amnesty International Publications, 1984), 214.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

Olano's judicial declaration claims he was tortured: beaten on the head and body, given electrical shocks, and nearly asphyxiated with a plastic bag."

The United Nations has adopted the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, which establish that prisoners are not to be subjected to undignified treatment or exposed to health-threatening conditions. I urge humane treatment of Joaquin Olano.<sup>83</sup>

Burnett's letter was part of a CAT group that sent thousands of similar letters to González, who sent a response to the Secretary General of AI. González explained the mistreatment of detainees concerned the Spanish government, and "preliminary proceedings have been ordered by a Court of Instruction in San Sebastián" for the Olano case.<sup>84</sup> In August 1984, there was a call to stop action on the Olano case, and by February 1985 the case was still open and under investigation. Following the Olano case, AIUSA focused on José María Olarra alongside his brothers. A bookstore worker and assistant mayor, Olarra was tortured incommunicado in a Guardia Civil station in October 1983. Olarra described in a formal declaration how "the leader of a group of eight or ten men in plain clothes hit him in the testicles and that he was then indiscriminately punched and slapped on the head and body by the others."<sup>85</sup> Similar to the outcome of Olano, Olarra's case underwent official investigation in 1985.

The Olano and Olarra campaigns would be the final letter writing campaigns for torture victims in Spain. The CAT in Spain ended in April 1985 when AIUSA narrowed its country focus, which left Spain off the list.<sup>86</sup> The reason for Spain's removal from AIUSA's list dealt with the introduction of *habeas corpus* to Spain's Constitution. Under

---

<sup>83</sup> Martha G. Burnett to Felipe González, April 24, 1984; Spain, 1983-1985; box 261; Emilie Trautmann Files, 1977-1988; Membership Mobilization, 1971-1995; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

<sup>84</sup> Felipe González to Thomas Hammarberg, July 19, 1984; Spain, 1983-1985; box 261; Emilie Trautmann Files, 1977-1988; Membership Mobilization, 1971-1995; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

<sup>85</sup> "José María Olarra, Spain;" Spain; Box 348; Other Campaigns and Supporting Files, 1979-1995; Campaign and Country Files, 1972-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

<sup>86</sup> Candy Markman and John Deckop, April 3, 1985; Spain; Box 348; Other Campaigns and Supporting Files, 1979-1995; Campaign and Country Files, 1972-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

the Law of Habeas Corpus of 24 May 1984, “a judge can order that a detainee be produced in court, and that the reasons and conditions of detention be justified.”<sup>87</sup> AI warned that the application of this procedure was difficult, but the government of Spain “stressed its willingness to cooperate in achieving Amnesty International’s aims.”<sup>88</sup> This illustrates AIUSA’s use of soft power as the CAT was successful.

Ultimately, human rights played a pivotal role in U.S.-Spain power relations during the Spanish transition to democracy. The subject played a pivotal role in the hard power of base negotiations and the attempt to build soft power through rhetoric. While the United States used education and television as avenues to build soft power, human rights threatened to upend this by illustrating the hypocrisy of supporting a dictator and maintaining military bases while championing a transition to democracy. Further, human rights are a useful cultural paradigm to show how each U.S. administration used power in their relations with Spain. Nixon ignored human rights in favor of hard power toward the Franco regime. Ford used smart power in praising the recently crowned Juan Carlos but used a hard power approach to AI in their condemnation of reports. The Carter administration used soft power as it emphasized human rights rhetoric and research from NGOs in their policies. However, they could not find a happy medium with the government, which hindered their soft power in the eyes of international NGOs. The Reagan administration praised Spain from afar in speeches and monitored the country’s liberalization but did not speak against the Spanish after NGOs presented evidence of continued torture.

---

<sup>87</sup> “Amnesty International Urges Safeguards Against Torture of Detainees in Spain,” July 2, 1985; Spain 1985-1988; box 364; Country Files, 1975-1995; Communications Department/Media Relations Files, 1973-1997; Amnesty International USA archives; CUL.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.



In addition, human rights illustrate how government organizations and NGOs often competed with one another on the power relationship. The four administrations had varying power relationships with Spain, but all refused to call them out for violations. This can be attributed to both reasons of hard and soft power. The United States chose to praise Spain to keep American authority of the bases. Moreover, the United States elected to exploit the Spanish transition to democracy just as they needed to repair their global image after the Vietnam War and Watergate. Conversely, the United States believed it could support human rights by championing the successful transition to democracy in Spain. While the presidential administrations had to maintain bilateral relationships, NGOs could point to human rights abuses and not fear upsetting an alliance. Even in the face of meticulous research and criticism from NGOs, the United States chose to not upset the balance of the Franco regime and the transition to democracy. In the end, whatever soft power the United States received from human rights came from NGOs and not from the presidential administrations.

## Conclusion

### Generalissimo Francisco Franco is Still Dead

The arc of U.S. smart power in Spain from its implementation in the late 1960s to the ascension to NATO and the EC in the 1980s illustrates the danger of relying too much on hard power. The negotiations for the Spanish military bases between the United States and the Franco regime kept him in power and helped solidify his authority. The benefits of these agreements for Franco were innumerable but were especially helpful in economic ways. By negotiating these agreements, the United States created anti-Americanism within the Spanish public. Furthering the pessimism in Spain was the disapproval and apathy of the American public. Although the Vietnam War caused the U.S. Congress and citizens to question the involvement with the authoritarian regime, it was not until the transition to democracy that Americans appeared interested in events of Spain. However, the Reagan administration's "wait and see" response to the 23-F coup solidified the anti-Americanism within Spain. Though they did not care for the paternalism of the United States, Spain did anticipate help from a democratic ally. However, when Haig responded that it was an "internal matter," Spaniards knew that the

United States did not care about the political system but cared about sustaining American friendly leadership.

Hard power continued to foster anti-Americanism in Spain as the United States bullied Spain through base negotiations, entrance to NATO, and ascension to the EC. The base negotiations showed the hard power of the United States fully. The presidents who oversaw base negotiations—Nixon, Ford, and Reagan—endeavored to get the best deal for the United States regardless of what Spain desired. This is best seen with Spain's desire for a treaty. During the negotiations, the Nixon administration discussed the possibility of a treaty, but then backed out by claiming Congress would never allow it. The United States wanted control of the bases to suit their Cold War needs, not the needs of Spain. In addition, the United States used a hard power inducement of Spanish entrance to NATO. Since World War II, Spain desired acceptance into the Western military structure and NATO was a key goal. The United States knew that their NATO allies did not want Francoist Spain to enter the Atlantic Alliance. Again, the U.S. administrations knowingly lied to Spain but this time about Spanish entrance into NATO. Finally, the United States tried to block the ascension of Spain into the EC. Spain actively sought Europeanization and sold themselves to the EC as an intermediary between Europe and Latin America. However, the United States feared Spanish EC membership because it threatened their domination of Spain's foreign policy and as the go-between of the United States and Latin America. The United States took Spain to GATT when Spain signed preferential trade agreements with the EC. Yet, as the transition to democracy occurred, Spain took hard power into their own hands. They voted to join the EC and

held a referendum to enter NATO. The Spanish public took the hard power enticements of the United States and implemented it themselves without American input.

To balance the negativity of hard power, the United States relied upon the USIA to build soft power. The main goal of the USIA was to employ public diplomacy to show the special connection between the United States and Spain. This can be seen with the promotion of NASA and Spain's involvement in the organizations and in the Bicentennial with the shared history of the two countries. As the transition occurred, the USIA's initiative changed to teach Spain about the economic rights of a democracy—labor unions and consumer protections. However, public diplomacy in Spain struggled to remain coherent and maintain public interest. For example, the NASA exhibits in Madrid and Barcelona produced meager foot traffic as well as the unexceptional reaction to Ford's visit to Madrid in 1975 showed disinterest by the Spanish public on USIA initiatives. Even during the Franco regime, the development of anti-Americanism hurt the USIA's public diplomacy. Further hindering the USIA were the changeovers of Carter and Reagan. Carter intended public diplomacy to be a megaphone for his speeches and policy decisions as opposed to programs and exchanges. Reagan returned the emphasis on these two issues in Spain, but most of the public diplomacy in his administration went to repairing the image of the United States following 23-F.

Other government organizations, along with the USIA, attempted to build U.S. soft power. The Fulbright program emphasized educational exchanges and initiatives in Spain. This included teaching English so that students connect the language with the United States, funding exchanges with labor unions leaders, and promoting the development of science and technology. Fulbright provided Spain with financial support

through NMAs for the 1970 General Law of Education. However, Fulbright's focus was to grow American Studies programs despite the low enrollment numbers and interest among Spaniards. USIA utilized television and provided TVE with documentaries to air that covered racial issues in the United States and the democratic process of the 1972 election cycle. The limited availability of television sets called into question whether this was a smart dissemination of knowledge, but it proved to be worthwhile as the number of television sets and networks grew. The United States had an opportunity with the Spanish transition to promote human rights. The implementation of democracy provided the United States with the model they could export to other regions, especially the Global South. Yet, there were still incidents of torture and Franco-era human rights abuses that the United States glossed over in their promotion of Spanish democracy. The presidential administrations chose not to upset the balance of U.S.-Spain relations by forcing the country to adopt human rights initiatives despite evidence from NGOs of the denial of civil liberties and torture.

The United State government was not the only group that provided methods of soft power during the Spanish transition to democracy. The FF helped Spain in their desire to develop and carry out educational reform. In his role as facilitator, Fraenkel travelled to Spain to help with the application of the 1970 General Law of Education. Further, the FF gave funding for academic conferences and publications that discussed the importance of the Spain and the transition to democracy. CTW offered Spain with a program to fit their lack of educational programming for children and young adults. *Barrio Sésamo* and *3-2-1 Contacto* gave TVE entertaining as well as educational productions that the Spanish public associated with the United States. Further, *Barrio*

*Sésamo* gave TVE an opportunity to develop Spanish identity in the successor generation through children's educational programming. The episodes allowed TVE to build Spanish pride through regional characters and Spanish art and culture. Human rights NGOs—from AI to U.S. ad hoc organizations—worked hard to make sure the Spanish transition adhered to civil liberties and human rights. AI and AIUSA provided evidence to the United States that torture and imprisonment of prisoners of conscience continued in Spain after the death of Franco.

What is evident from the FF, CTW, and AI, NGOs can provide the United States with soft power. The FF developed soft power with Fraenkel and their work in implementing educational reform. CTW provided an international co-production that detailed American ideals as well as an avenue to develop a Spanish national identity. AI and other human rights NGOs provided a voice for those in Spain who suffered and those who wanted to promote civil liberties. However, there can be some danger from NGOs' soft power. CTW could have upended the progress made with Spanish television with the misunderstandings and censoring of Spanish culture. Further, human rights NGOs pointed to torture and imprisonment, which the United States government ignored to keep the status quo with the Spanish government. Yet, soft power is not the goal of NGOs. The priority for these organizations is the improvement of another country not selling the American image. Though it is not their initiative, NGOs did contribute to the development of soft power and smart power in Spain.

### **Coda: To 1992 and Beyond**

Smart power continued to influence U.S.-Spain relations into the 1990s. In the fall of 1987, the USIA and Intergallup Spain put together a focus group study. The choice of

Spain came from a public opinion poll in Spain that found negative attitudes on the United States, NATO, and the military bases in Spain. The focus group consisted of eighty-seven participants. Those who partook ranged from the general public to elites, came from Madrid, Seville, and Barcelona, and their ages ranged from twenty-five to fifty-seven. The general public included housewives, secretaries, clerks, technicians, and those looking for their first jobs. The elites were university professors, lawyers, medical doctors, economists, and high-level executives. One-fourth of the participants were women. The central finding of the study stressed the importance of Spain and the events in 1992—total integration into the EC, the Summer Olympics in Barcelona, the World’s Expo in Seville, and the designation of Madrid as the cultural capital of Europe.<sup>1</sup> Spain was to become European in 1992 and no longer needed the United States.

Some of the key discussions broke into three categories: expectations for 1992, Europeanization, and the United States. The public saw 1992 as the year Spain would showcase their progress to the world. The Olympics, World’s Expo, and Madrid as the cultural capital were events that Spain knew would put the global eye on them. However, these events took a backseat to the importance of Europeanization. The Spanish public eagerly anticipated entering the EC and passively accepted that NATO membership was integral for Europeanization. The emphasis on Europeanization of Spain was because some in Spain believed this was “one of the last opportunities for Spain to catch up with the countries of the developed world.” Though the public was united on 1992 and Europeanization, Spain was divided over the United States. As one elite from Madrid explained, “I believe that with the Americans we have an authentic schizophrenia.”

---

<sup>1</sup> “Spanish Public’s Views on Relations with U.S. and USSR and Selected International Issues: A Focus Group Study,” USIA Office of Research; R-9-1989; box 57; Research Reports, 1960-1999, Office of Research; RG 306; NARA.

Further, the study identified the Spanish identification of the United States as the older brother or uncle—some who “is admired and imitated, but against whom one also rebels and asserts one’s independence.” These split views of the United States can be attributed to U.S. smart power during the transition.<sup>2</sup>

The focus group found a few topics to discuss on domestic politics such as the development of the Spanish democracy and anti-Americanism. The conversations on democratization illustrate the perception of Juan Carlos and the Spanish people as the drivers of democracy. As one member of the general public in Madrid said, “If it wasn’t for the Spanish people there wouldn’t be a democracy.” This is further insinuated by the focus group in a discussion on anti-Americanism. The right-leaning participants believed anti-Americanism was a result of media manipulation, but the left-leaning members saw it as a result of Franco support. One individual from Seville compared the U.S. support of Franco to the contemporaneous example of Augusto Pinochet in Chile: “They supported Franco. If they hadn’t, Franco wouldn’t have lasted five minutes. When General Eisenhower came to embrace him, that was it. The regime was consolidated. As it is now with Pinochet. If he goes, we all know why he goes, because the United States says so. And why does it say so? Because its interests are now better defined by a democracy.”<sup>3</sup>

What this illustrates is that those within Spain did not associate foreign support with the establishment of democracy. The common belief was that the King of Spain developed, instituted, and fostered the implementation of the constitutional monarchy. The Spanish public grasped this and pushed the transition to democracy through democratic elections and referendums. In no way do they believe the United States

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.



imported democracy. Instead, that paternalistic portrayal of the United States carried over the anti-Americanism that developed under the bilateral relationship with Franco. The use of hard power by U.S. leader during the transition did little to engender any sort of believe that the bilateral relationship would change. Further, the comment by Haig on 23-F cemented the anti-Americanism. The Spanish public witnessed their lone friend on the global stage remain neutral to see what would happen instead of intervening to protect Spanish democracy.

Anti-Americanism remained prevalent when discussions turned to U.S. foreign policy. In dialogues of the U.S.-Spain bilateral agreement, opinions fell into three distinct categories: those who were indifferent, those who believed the bases should remain, and those who believed the United States must go. The major argument of those who wanted U.S. removal from the bases was that if the United States controlled the bases then there will be no independence or national sovereignty for Spain. Across all categories, the participants believed the Spanish government “negotiated badly and some even say that the protracted negotiations made them look bad throughout Europe.” Further, the Spanish public still believed that the Americans dominated NATO and the connection between the United States and the Atlantic Alliance was too close. They reason that NATO was “a powerful negative symbol which has the potential of arousing hostile reactions among the Spanish mass public.” Some participants argued for the Western European Union for their defensive and security concerns alongside their economic assistance with the EC.<sup>4</sup>

Hard power continued to define how Spaniards viewed the United States. Particularly, the fear that U.S. hard power would have negative effects on Spain during their Europeanization. The bases issue split the focus group much like how it split about

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

anti-Americanism. Yet, there was a consensus that the United States took advantage of a weak Franco regime and negotiated the previous agreements in bad faith. The tactics of the U.S. administrations during negotiations, especially those of Nixon and Reagan, did nothing to engender confidence and dispel anti-Americanism in Spain. In addition, because the Franco regime and early transition politicians placed so much emphasis on NATO entrance, the Spanish public believed the United States dominated the organization. Instead, those in the focus group wanted to join a weaker European security organization just to get away from the United States.

Imperialism was a common theme in the depiction of the United States whether it be cultural imperialism or economic imperialism. The Spaniards in the focus group believed the only shared value with the United States was consumerism. American culture permeated Spain in various forms, but the imports became slogans for inferior and brash. American culture such as films, televisions, and corporations were a challenge to Spanish values. The study found that Spaniards resented the United States because “the Spanish believe that Americans don’t know anything about them ... nor does it care.” What these participants believed was that the United States took their cultural model and placed it in Spain, and by doing this made Spain economically dependent upon the United States. This can be seen in the discussion of military bases as well. Those who proposed keeping the military bases voiced concerns over the economic fallout if the United States were to leave. Further, many Spaniards believed dependence on the United States allowed them to interfere in domestic politics.<sup>5</sup>

Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and the USIA spent much of their efforts attempting to tie Spain and the United States historically. The results of this focus group demonstrate

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

that this clearly did not work. In the most damning quote of the study, the Spanish public believed that Americans did not care about Spain, their historical connections, or their values despite the claims of the U.S. presidents. The first issue discussed as a shared value with the United States was not a sense of history but that of consumerism. While consumer rights and protections were a goal of the Reagan USIA, there was more an emphasis on cultural imperialism through consumerism. The abundance of American culture was not seen as a complement to Spanish culture but as a competitor. As this permeated Spanish culture, it made Spain dependent on the United States.

The findings of the focus group study illustrate the impact of the soft power of educational exchanges, television, and human rights. The focus group viewed American science and technology in a favorable light. Spanish companies, laboratories, hospitals, and universities were eager to adapt the models presented to them by the United States. However, the focus group believed that Americans did not have a grasp of world events as they were too insular. They compared the United States to the Soviet Union and argued that Russians were “an educated man while the American does not even know any geography.” Those in the focus group explained that they got most of their knowledge on the United States from movies and television. Their understanding of racial problems, the homeless, violence, and drug use came from the visual media that the United States exported. Shows like *Dallas*, *Dynasty*, and *Falcon Crest* crafted Spanish perceptions of Americans. One member of the general public in Madrid explained the Spanish version of *The Price is Right*—*El Precio Justo* aired on TVE sporadically from 1988 to 2004—was popular but was a distinctly “American idea and they’re exporting it to everyone.” While the United States used them as an example of democracy and human rights to

other transitioning nations, the Spanish public believed that Spain still had work to do. Many felt there were defects in the judicial system, lack of equality, and corrupt politicians. As one member of the general public in Barcelona explained, “There’s a bit left ... we need what good wines need, time to get used to living under a different system from the one we had for so many years.”<sup>6</sup>

The focus group illustrates the success and failures of U.S. and NGO soft power. The approval of American science and technology in Spain illustrates that the efforts of the Fulbright program to promote the subjects. Yet, the belief in Spain was that the United States was not an educated country, but instead a nation that promoted their ideals through media. In Spain, they were aware of the societal problems of the United States, which illustrates that the USIA documentaries and news programs did work in providing a balanced account of U.S. society. Yet, the television programs the focus group highlighted were shows about the opulence of the United States. These entertainments informed the Spanish public of American values and they could not separate them from their views of the United States, which is like the reactions to *¡Abrete Sésamo!* When asked about democracy and human rights, the focus group believed that while Spain made strides in their democratic evolution, they still needed time to progress. The study pointed to various issues with civil liberties, which also received discussions from human rights NGOs like Amnesty International.

Overall, what the Spanish focus group study illustrates is that U.S. smart power in Spain during the transition to democracy struggled to change the perception of Americans in the eyes of Spaniards. The hard power of the United States—the military bases and NATO—dominated how the Spanish public viewed Americans. The U.S. administrations

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

and their attempts to bully Spain in negotiations left a sour impression. Ford and Carter attempted to ease the tensions of U.S. hard power, but the Cold War stances of Nixon and Reagan were too much. The soft power attempted by GOs and NGOs found mixed results at best, which made it difficult for the United States to establish smart power with Spain. Educational exchanges from the Fulbright program and FF built support for science and technology, but the American Studies programs in Spain did not engender the United States as a bastion for education. U.S. television programs sent through the USIA and CTW allowed the United States to interact in a more direct manner with the Spanish public, but the messages taken from the programs shown often portrayed the United States in a negative light. The Spanish were proud of their participation in the transition to democracy; however, as NGOs pointed out, believed they still had many strides left to achieve civil liberties and move on from Franco.

## REFERENCES

### Archives

Columbia University Library, New York City, New York  
Amnesty International USA Archives

Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan  
National Security Adviser: Memoranda of Conversations  
National Security Adviser: NSC Europe, Canada, and Ocean Affairs Staff Files, 1974-77  
National Security Adviser: Presidential Files for Europe and Canada, 1974-77  
U.S. National Security Council  
White House Central Files

Jimmy Carter Presidential Library, Atlanta, Georgia  
Barry Jagoda Papers  
NSA Brzezinski Material  
Plains Files  
Records of the Council of Economic Advisers  
Staff Offices Press Granum  
Walter Mondale Papers  
White House Central File  
Zbigniew Brzezinski Collection

Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York City, New York  
Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Papers  
P&S *Guernica* Records

National Archives II, College Park, Maryland  
Record Group 59 – Department of State Files  
Record Group 306 – United States Information Agency Files

New York University Library, New York City, New York  
Spanish Refugee Aid Records  
Speeches in the Records of the Office of the President

Richard Nixon Presidential Library, Yorba Linda, California  
Henry A. Kissinger Office Files  
NSC Files, Country Files – Europe  
NSC Files, President's Trip Files  
NSC Files, Subject Files  
NSC Files, VIP Visits  
President's Personal File, White House Social Events  
White House Central File

Rockefeller Archives Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York  
Blanchette H. Rockefeller Papers  
Ford Foundation Records  
Nelson Rockefeller Vice Presidential Records

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, Simi Valley, California  
C. Landon Parvin Files  
Dennis C. Blair Files  
Edward Stucky Files  
NSC Staff and Offices, European and Soviet Affairs Directorate  
NSC Staff and Offices, Peter Sommer Files  
Office of Media Relations Records  
Office of Speech Writing: Research Office Records  
Virginia H. Knauer Files  
Walter Raymond Files  
White House Office of Records Management, Subject File, CO 145  
White House Staff and Office Files, European and Soviet Affairs Directorate  
Records  
William P. Clark Files

University of Arkansas Libraries, Fayetteville, Arkansas  
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection  
Council for International Exchange of Scholars Records

University of Maryland Library, College Park, Maryland  
Children's Television Workshop Archives

Published Interviews

*Frontline Diplomacy: The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training*. Library of Congress

Robert Barbour  
Jack R. Binns  
Stephen C. Bosworth

Thomas R. Carmichael  
Jon David Glassman  
Francis M. Kinnelly  
Clint Lauderdale  
Edward C. McBride  
McKinney Russell  
Robert E. Service  
David E. Simcox  
Terence Todman

Government Publications

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volume XLI, Western Europe; NATO, 1969-1972.* eds. James E. Miller, Laurie Van Hook, and David S. Patterson. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2012.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1973-1976, Volume E-15, Part 2, Western Europe, 1973-1976.* ed. Kathleen B. Rasmussen. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2014.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume I, Foundations of Foreign Policy.* eds. Kristin L. Ahlberg and Adam M. Howard. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2014.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume III, Foreign Economic Policy.* eds. Kathleen B. Rasmussen and Adam M. Howard. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2013.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume XXIII, Mexico, Cuba, and the Caribbean.* eds. Alexander O. Poster and Adam M. Howard. Washington: United States Government Publishing Office, 2016.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume XXX, Public Diplomacy.* eds. Kristin L. Ahlberg and Adam M. Howard. Washington: United States Government Publishing Office, 2016.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume II, Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.* eds. Kristin Ahlberg Adam M. Howard. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 2013.

*Public Papers of the President: Gerald R. Ford, 1975.* Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1977.

Newspapers and Magazines

*Diez Minutos*

*El País*

*Garbo*



*Los Angeles Times*  
*New York Times*  
*Pueblo*  
*Time*  
*Wall Street Journal*  
*Washington Post*  
*YA*

Printed Primary Sources

Alba, Víctor. *Transition in Spain: From Franco to Democracy*, translated by Barbara Lotito. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1978.

Amnesty International. *Political Imprisonment in Spain*. London: Amnesty International Publications, 1973.

———. *Report of an Amnesty International Mission to Spain, 3-28 October 1979*. London: Amnesty International Publications, 1980.

———. *Torture in the Eighties*. London: Amnesty International Publications, 1984.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Adviser, 1977-1981*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983.

Carter, Jimmy. *White House Diary*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2010.

Eaton, Samuel D. *The Forces of Freedom in Spain, 1974-1979: A Personal Account*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1981.

Ford, Gerald R. *A Time to Heal: The Autobiography of Gerald R. Ford*. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

Kissinger, Henry. *White House Years*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979.

Books, Articles, and Book Chapters

Agüero, Felipe. *Soldiers, Civilians, and Democracy: Post-Franco Spain in Comparative Perspective*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Anderson, Carol. *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Belmonte, Laura. *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Blinkhorn, Martin. *Democracy and Civil War in Spain, 1931-1939*. London: Routledge, 1996.

- Borgardt, Elizabeth. *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Borstelmann, Thomas. *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Buchanan, Tom. "How 'Different' Was Spain? The Later Franco Regime in International Context." In *Spain Transformed: The Late Franco Dictatorship, 1959-75* ed. Nigel Townson. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Calvo-Gonzalez, Oscar. "American Military Interest and Economic Confidence in Spain under the Franco Dictatorship." *The Journal of Economic History* 67, no. 3 (2007): 740-767.
- Carr, Raymond. *Spanish Tragedy: Civil War in Perspective*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1977.
- Casanova, Julián. *The Spanish Republic and Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Cole, Charlotte F. ".29: The Global Sesame Effect." In *The Sesame Effect: The Global Impact of the Longest Street in the World* eds. Charlotte F. Cole and June H. Lee. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Coverdale, John F. *The Political Transformation of Spain After Franco*. New York: Praeger, 1979.
- Crespo MacLennan, Julio. *Spain and the Process of European Integration, 1957-85*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.
- Cull, Nicholas J. *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Doyle, Don. *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War*. New York: Basic Books, 2015.
- Eckel, Jan and Samuel Moyn, eds. *The Breakthrough: Human Rights in the 1970s*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Edgerton, Gary R. "Introduction." In *Television Histories: Shaping Collective Memory in the Media Age*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001.
- Edles, Laura Desfor. *Symbol and Ritual in the New Spain: The Transition to Democracy after Franco*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- Encarnación, Omar G. *Democracy Without Justice in Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- Esenwein, George and Adrian Shubert, *Spain at War: The Spanish Civil War in Context, 1931-1939*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Ferguson, Niall, Charles S. Maier, Erez Manela, and Daniel J. Sargent, eds. *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- García Cantalapiedra, “Spanish Foreign Policy, the United States, and Soft Bandwagoning.” In *Contemporary Spanish Foreign Policy*, eds. David García Cantalapiedra and Ramon Pacheco Pardo. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Gómez-Escalónilla, Lorenzo Delgado, Pablo León Aguinaga, Oscar J. Martín García, Esther M. Sánchez Sánchez, eds. *El factor internacional en la modernización educativa, científica y militar de España*. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2017.
- , Ricardo Martín de la Guardia, and Rosa Pardo Sanz, eds. *La apertura internacional de España: Entre el franquismo y la democracia (1953-1986)*. Madrid: Sílex, 2016.
- Graham, Helen. *The Spanish Civil War: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Groves, Tamar and Cecilia Milito Barone. “Imagining a Democratic Future, Forgetting a Worrisome Past: Educational Policy, School Textbooks, and Teachers under the Franco Regime.” *War & Society* 33, no. 1 (Feb. 2014): 43-58.
- . *Teachers and the Struggle for Democracy in Spain, 1970-1985*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Hanhimäki, Jussi M. *The Rise and Fall of Détente: American Foreign Policy and the Transformation of the Cold War*. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2013.
- Hart, Justin. *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Heiberg, Morten. *U.S.-Spanish Relations after Franco, 1975-1989: The Will of the Weak*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2018.
- Hendershot, Heather. “Sesame Street: Cognition and Communications Imperialism.” in *Kids’ Media Culture* ed. Marsha Kinder. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

- Hill, Christopher. *The Role of Elites in the Spanish Transition to Democracy (1975-1981): Motors of Change*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007.
- Hilton, Sylvia L. "The Study of U.S. History in Spain." In *Teaching and Studying U.S. History in Europe: Past, Present and Future* eds. Cornelis A. van Minnen and Sylvia L. Hilton. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2007.
- Hixon, Walter. *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Hooper, John. *The New Spaniards*. New York: Penguin Books, 1995.
- Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007.
- Hunt, Michael. *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.
- Iriye, Akira, Petra Goedde, and William I. Hitchcock, eds. *The Human Rights Revolution: An International History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Jackson, Gabriel. *The Spanish Republic and the Civil War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Johnson, Lonnie R. "The Fulbright Program and the Philosophy and Geography of US Exchange Programs Since World War II." In *Global Exchanges: Scholarships and Transnational Circulations in the Modern World* eds. Ludovic Tournès and Giles Scott-Smith. New York: Berghahn, 2018.
- Kauffman, Victor S. "The Bureau of Human Rights under the Carter Administration." *The Historian* 61 (1), 1998: 51-66.
- Keys, Barbara. *Reclaiming American Virtue: The Human Rights Revolution of the 1970s*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Liedtke, Boris N. "Spain and the United States, 1945-1975." In *Spain and the Great Powers in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Sebastian Balfour and Paul Preston. London: Routledge, 1999.

- . *Embracing a Dictatorship: U.S. Relations with Spain, 1945-53*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996.
- López III, Fred A. "Bourgeois State and the Rise of Social Democracy in Spain." In *Transitions from Dictatorship to Democracy: Comparative Studies of Spain, Portugal, and Greece* ed. Ronald H. Chilcote. New York: Taylor & Francis, 1990.
- Ludlow, N. Piers. "The Real Years of Europe?: U.S.-Western European Relations during the Ford Administration." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 15, no. 3 (2013): 136-161.
- Malefakis, Edward. *Agrarian Reform and Peasant Revolution in Spain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Maxwell, Richard. "Spatial Eruptions, Global Grids: Regionalist TV in Spain and Dialectics of Identity Politics." In *Refiguring Spain: Cinema, Media, Representation* ed. Marsha Kinder. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Montero Jiménez, José Antonio. "Diplomacia pública, debate político e historiografía en la política exterior de los Estados Unidos (1938-2008)." *Ayer* 75 (2009): 63-95.
- Moyn, Samuel. *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018.
- . *The Last Utopia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Mujal-Leon, Eusebio, "Rei(g)ning in Spain." *Foreign Policy* 51 (Summer 1983): 101-117.
- Nichter, Luke. *Richard Nixon and Europe: The Reshaping of the Postwar Atlantic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Niño, Antonio. *La americanización de España*. Madrid: Catarata, 2012.
- Notaker, Hallvard, Giles Scott-Smith and David J. Snyder, eds. *Reasserting America in the 1970s: U.S. Public Diplomacy and the Rebuilding of America's Image Abroad*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Nye, Jr., Joseph S. "Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power." *Foreign Affairs* 88, no. 4 (July/August 2009): 160-163
- . "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616, no. 1 (March 2008): 94-109.

- . “Smart Power.” *New Perspectives Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (2009): 7-9
- . *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.
- Osgood, Kenneth and Brian Etheridge, eds. *The United States and Public Diplomacy: New Directions in Cultural and International History*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2010.
- Pardo Sanz, Rosa. “La política norteamericana,” *Ayer* 49 (2003).
- Payne, Stanley G. *The Franco Regime, 1936-1975*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
- . *Spain’s First Democracy: The Second Republic, 1931-1936*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993.
- . *The Collapse of the Spanish Republic, 1933-1936: Origins of the Civil War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Philip, George. *Oil and Politics in Latin America: Nationalist Movements and State Companies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Powell, Charles T. “Spain’s External Relations, 1969-1975.” In *Democratic Spain: Reshaping External Relations in a Changing World*, eds. Richard Gillespie, Fernando Rodrigo, and Jonathan Story. London: Routledge, 1995.
- . “The United States and Spain: From Franco to Juan Carlos.” In *Spain Transformed: The Late Dictatorship, 1959-75*, ed. Nigel Townson. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- and Juan Carlos Jiménez, eds. *Del Autoritarismo a la Democracia: Estudios de Política Exterior Española*. Madrid: Silex, 2007.
- . *El Amigo Americano: España y Estados Unidos: de la Dictadura a la Democracia*. Barcelona: Galaxia Guttenberg, 2011.
- . *Juan Carlos of Spain: Self-Made Monarch*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1996.
- Preston, Paul. *Juan Carlos: Steering Spain from Dictatorship to Democracy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2004.
- . *The Spanish Civil War*. London: Harper Perennial, 2006.

- . *The Triumph of Democracy in Spain*. London: Routledge, 1986.
- Radosh, Ronald and Mary R. Habeck, *Spain Betrayed: The Soviet Union in the Spanish Civil War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Robinson, Richard A.H. *The Origins of Franco's Spain: The Right, the Republic, and Revolution, 1931-1936*. Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1970.
- Rodríguez Jiménez, Francisco Javier, Lorenzo Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, and Nicholas J. Cull. *U.S. Public Diplomacy and Democratization in Spain: Selling Democracy?*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Rosendorf, Neal M. *Franco Sells Spain to America: Hollywood, Tourism and Public Relations as Postwar Spanish Soft Power*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Rubottom, R. Richard and J. Carter Murphy. *Spain and the United States: Since World War II*. New York: Praeger, 1984.
- Sargent, Daniel J. *A Superpower Transformed: The Remaking of American Foreign Relations in the 1970s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Schmitz, David F. *Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Schulman, Bruce J. *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics*. New York: Free Press, 2001.
- Schulz, Mathias and Thomas Schwartz, eds. *The Strained Alliance: U.S.-European Relations from Nixon to Carter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. "Laying the Foundations: U.S. Public Diplomacy and the Promotion of American Studies in Europe." In *Teaching and Studying U.S. History in Europe: Past, Present and Future* eds. Cornelius A. van Minnen and Sylvia L. Hilton. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2007.
- Seidman, Michael. *Republic of Egos: A History of the Spanish Civil War*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002.
- Sellars, Kristen. *The Rise and Rise of Human Rights*. Stroud: Sutton, 2002.
- Snyder, Sarah. *From Selma to Moscow: How Human Rights Activists Transformed U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2018.
- . *Human Rights Activism and the End of the Cold War: A Transnational History of the Helsinki Network*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

- Song, H. Rosi. *Lost in Transition: Constructing Memory in Contemporary Spain*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016.
- Story, Jonathan. "Spain's External Relations Redefined: 1975-89." In *Democratic Spain: Reshaping External Relations in a Changing World*, eds. Richard Gillespie, Fernando Rodrigo, and Jonathan Story. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Stuckey, Mary. *Jimmy Carter, Human Rights, and the National Agenda*. College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2008.
- Thomas, Hugh. *The Spanish Civil War*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961.
- Tussell, Javier. *Spain: From Dictatorship to Democracy*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell Publishing, 2011.
- Van Hensbergen, Gijs. *Guernica: The Biography of a Twentieth-Century Icon*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2004.
- Viñas, Ángel. "Breaking the Shackles from the Past: Spanish Foreign Policy from Franco to Felipe González." In *Spain and the Great Powers in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Sebastian Balfour and Paul Preston. London: Routledge, 1999.
- . *En las garras del águila: Los pactos con Estados Unidos de Francisco Franco a Felipe González (1945-1995)*. Barcelona, Critica, 2003.
- Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Zanchetta, Barbara. *The Transformation of American International Power in the 1970s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Thesis
- Engstrand, Kristin. "Barrio Sésamo/Barri Sèsam and the Global/Local Dynamic: A Case Study of the Spanish Cultural Adaptation of Sesame Street." University of Washington, 1997.



VITA

David Andrew Justice

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE ROLE OF SMART POWER IN U.S.-SPAIN RELATIONS, 1969-1986

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in History at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2020.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Arts in History at University of North Alabama, Florence, Alabama in 2014.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in History at Athens State University, Athens, Alabama in 2012.

Experience:

Teaching Associate in History Department, Oklahoma State University, 2014-2020

Instructor of Record for Survey of American History, Oklahoma State University, Spring 2019 & Summer 2019

Professional Memberships:

American Historical Association

Organization of American Historians

Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations